

Algebraic Geometry over C^∞ -rings

Dominic Joyce

Abstract

If X is a manifold then the $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra $C^\infty(X)$ of smooth functions $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^∞ -ring. That is, for each smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ there is an n -fold operation $\Phi_f : C^\infty(X)^n \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ acting by $\Phi_f : (c_1, \dots, c_n) \mapsto f(c_1, \dots, c_n)$, and these operations Φ_f satisfy many natural identities. Thus, $C^\infty(X)$ actually has a far richer structure than the obvious $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra structure.

We explain the foundations of a version of algebraic geometry in which rings or algebras are replaced by C^∞ -rings. As schemes are the basic objects in algebraic geometry, the new basic objects are C^∞ -schemes, a category of geometric objects which generalize manifolds, and whose morphisms generalize smooth maps. We also study *quasicoherent* and *coherent sheaves* on C^∞ -schemes, and C^∞ -stacks, in particular *Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks*, a 2-category of geometric objects generalizing orbifolds.

Many of these ideas are not new: C^∞ -rings and C^∞ -schemes have long been part of synthetic differential geometry. But we develop them in new directions. In a sequel [22] the author will use these tools to define *d-manifolds* and *d-orbifolds*, ‘derived’ versions of manifolds and orbifolds related to Spivak’s ‘derived manifolds’ [39]. These in turn will have applications in symplectic geometry, as the geometric structure on moduli spaces of J -holomorphic curves. This paper is surveyed in [21].

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	C^∞-rings	5
2.1	Two definitions of C^∞ -ring	5
2.2	C^∞ -rings as commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras, and ideals	7
2.3	C^∞ -local rings, and localization	9
2.4	Fair C^∞ -rings	10
2.5	Good C^∞ -rings	11
2.6	Pushouts of C^∞ -rings	14
3	The C^∞-ring $C^\infty(X)$ of a manifold X	16

4	C^∞-ringed spaces and C^∞-schemes	19
4.1	C^∞ -ringed spaces and local C^∞ -ringed spaces	19
4.2	Affine C^∞ -schemes	20
4.3	Locally finite sums in fair C^∞ -rings	26
4.4	General C^∞ -schemes	27
5	Modules over C^∞-rings	30
5.1	Modules	30
5.2	Complete modules over fair C^∞ -rings	31
5.3	Cotangent modules of C^∞ -rings	34
6	Sheaves of modules on C^∞-schemes	40
6.1	Sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on a C^∞ -ringed space $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$	40
6.2	Sheaves on affine C^∞ -schemes, and MSpec	42
6.3	Quasicoherent and coherent sheaves on C^∞ -schemes	45
6.4	Cotangent sheaves of C^∞ -schemes	46
7	Background material on stacks	50
7.1	Grothendieck topologies, sites, prestacks, and stacks	50
7.2	Commutative diagrams and fibre products	52
7.3	Descent theory on a site	53
7.4	Properties of 1-morphisms	55
7.5	Geometric stacks, and stacks associated to groupoids	56
8	C^∞-stacks and orbifolds	60
8.1	C^∞ -stacks	60
8.2	Properties of morphisms of C^∞ -stacks	62
8.3	Open C^∞ -substacks and open covers	64
8.4	Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks	65
8.5	Characterizing Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks	68
8.6	The underlying topological space of a C^∞ -stack	71
8.7	Coarse moduli C^∞ -schemes of C^∞ -stacks	74
8.8	Orbifolds as Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks	76
9	Sheaves on Deligne–Mumford C^∞-stacks	79
9.1	$\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, quasicoherent and coherent sheaves	79
9.2	Writing sheaves in terms of a groupoid presentation	82
9.3	Pullback of sheaves as a pseudofunctor	84
9.4	Cotangent sheaves of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks	87
	References	90

1 Introduction

Let X be a smooth manifold, and write $C^\infty(X)$ for the set of smooth functions $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then $C^\infty(X)$ is a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra, with operations of

addition, multiplication, and scalar multiplication defined pointwise. However, $C^\infty(X)$ has much more structure than this. For example, if $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth then $\exp(c) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, and this defines an operation $\exp : C^\infty(X) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ which cannot be expressed algebraically in terms of the $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra structure. More generally, if $n \geq 0$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, define an n -fold operation $\Phi_f : C^\infty(X)^n \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ by

$$(\Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n))(x) = f(c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)),$$

for all $c_1, \dots, c_n \in C^\infty(X)$ and $x \in X$. These operations satisfy many identities: suppose $m, n \geq 0$, and $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions. Define a smooth function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g(f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n)),$$

for all $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for all $c_1, \dots, c_n \in C^\infty(X)$ we have

$$\Phi_h(c_1, \dots, c_n) = \Phi_g(\Phi_{f_1}(c_1, \dots, c_n), \dots, \Phi_{f_m}(c_1, \dots, c_n)). \quad (1)$$

A C^∞ -ring $(\mathfrak{C}, (\Phi_f)_{f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}})$ is a set $\mathfrak{C}$ with operations $\Phi_f : \mathfrak{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ for all $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth satisfying identities (1), and one other condition. Then $C^\infty(X)$ is a C^∞ -ring for any manifold X , but there are also many C^∞ -rings which do not come from manifolds, and can be thought of as representing geometric objects which generalize manifolds.

The most basic objects in conventional algebraic geometry are commutative rings R , or commutative $\mathbb{K}$ -algebras R for some field $\mathbb{K}$. The ‘spectrum’ $\text{Spec } R$ of R is an affine scheme, and R is interpreted as an algebra of functions on $\text{Spec } R$. More general kinds of spaces in algebraic geometry — schemes and stacks — are locally modelled on affine schemes $\text{Spec } R$. This paper lays down the foundations of *Algebraic Geometry over C^∞ -rings*, in which we replace commutative rings in algebraic geometry by C^∞ -rings. It includes the study of C^∞ -schemes and *Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks*, two classes of geometric spaces generalizing manifolds and orbifolds, respectively.

This is not a new idea, but was studied years ago as part of *synthetic differential geometry*, which grew out of ideas of Lawvere in the 1960s; see for instance Dubuc [11] on C^∞ -schemes, and the books by Moerdijk and Reyes [33] and Kock [23]. However, we have new things to say, as we are motivated by different problems (see below), and so are asking different questions.

Following Dubuc’s discussion of ‘models of synthetic differential geometry’ [9] and oversimplifying a bit, symplectic differential geometers are interested in C^∞ -schemes as they provide a category $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ of geometric objects which includes smooth manifolds and certain ‘infinitesimal’ objects, and all fibre products exist in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, and $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ has some other nice properties to do with open covers, and exponentials of infinitesimals.

Synthetic differential geometry concerns proving theorems about manifolds using synthetic reasoning involving ‘infinitesimals’. But one needs to check these methods of synthetic reasoning are valid. To do this you need a ‘model’, some

category of geometric spaces including manifolds and infinitesimals, in which you can think of your synthetic arguments as happening. Once you know there exists at least one model with the properties you want, then as far as synthetic differential geometry is concerned the job is done. For this reason C^∞ -schemes have not been developed very far in synthetic differential geometry.

Recently, C^∞ -rings and C^∞ -ringed spaces appeared in a very different context, as part of David Spivak's definition of *derived manifolds* [39]. Spivak was a student of Jacob Lurie, and his goal was to extend parts of Lurie's 'derived algebraic geometry' programme [26] to differential geometry. Spivak's construction is very complex and technical, and his derived manifolds form a *simplicial category*, a kind of ∞ -category with n -morphisms for all $n \geq 1$.

In [22], the author will develop a theory of 'derived differential geometry' which simplifies, and goes beyond, Spivak's derived manifolds. Our notion of derived manifolds are called *d-manifolds*, and are built using the theory of locally fair C^∞ -schemes and quasicoherent sheaves upon them of this paper. They form a 2-category. We also study *d-manifolds with boundary*, and *d-manifolds with corners*, and orbifold versions of all these, *d-orbifolds*, which are built using the theory of locally fair Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks and quasicoherent sheaves upon them of this paper.

Many areas of symplectic geometry involve moduli spaces $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(J, \beta)$ of stable J -holomorphic curves in a symplectic manifold (M, ω) . The original motivation for the project of [22] was to find a good geometric description for the geometric structure on such moduli spaces $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(J, \beta)$. In the Lagrangian Floer cohomology theory of Fukaya, Oh, Ohta and Ono [13], moduli spaces $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(J, \beta)$ are given the structure of *Kuranishi spaces*. Their theory of Kuranishi spaces seemed to the author to be unsatisfactory and incomplete. In trying improve it, and making use of ideas from Spivak [39], the author arrived at the d-manifolds and d-orbifolds theory of [22]. The author believes that the 'correct' definition of Kuranishi space in the work of Fukaya et al. [13] should be that a Kuranishi space is a d-orbifold with corners.

To set up our theory of d-manifolds and d-orbifolds requires a lot of preliminary work on C^∞ -schemes and C^∞ -stacks, and quasicoherent sheaves upon them. That is the purpose of this paper. We have tried to present a complete, self-contained account which should be understandable to readers with a reasonable background in algebraic geometry, and we assume no familiarity with synthetic differential geometry. We expect this material may have other applications quite different to those the author has in mind [22], which is why we have written it as a separate paper, and tried to give a general picture rather than just those parts needed for [22].

Section 2 explains C^∞ -rings. The archetypal examples of C^∞ -rings, $C^\infty(X)$ for manifolds X , are discussed in §3. Section 4 studies C^∞ -schemes, §5 modules over C^∞ -rings, and §6 sheaves of modules over C^∞ -schemes, quasicoherent sheaves, and coherent sheaves. Sections 7–9 generalize §4 and §6 to C^∞ -stacks. We are particularly interested in *Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks*, which are C^∞ -stacks locally modelled on $[\underline{U}/G]$ for $\underline{U}$ an affine C^∞ -scheme and G a finite group acting on $\underline{U}$, since Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks generalize orbifolds in the same

way that C^∞ -schemes generalize manifolds.

Almost all of §2–§4 is already understood in synthetic differential geometry, such as Dubuc [11] and Moerdijk and Reyes [33], except for *good* C^∞ -rings, which appear to be a new idea, (locally) good C^∞ -schemes, and some facts about the C^∞ -rings and C^∞ -schemes of manifolds with boundary or corners. But we believe it is worthwhile giving a detailed and self-contained exposition, from our own point of view. Section 7 summarizes material on stacks from [2, 3, 15, 24, 28, 34]. Sections 5–6 and 8–9 are new, so far as the author knows, though they are based on well known material in algebraic geometry. This paper is surveyed in [21].

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Eduardo Dubuc and Jacob Lurie for helpful conversations.

2 C^∞ -rings

We begin by explaining the basic objects out of which our theories are built, C^∞ -rings, or *smooth rings*. The archetypal example of a C^∞ -ring is the vector space $C^\infty(X)$ of smooth functions $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for a manifold X , and these will be discussed at greater length in §3. The material on *good* C^∞ -rings in §2.5–§2.6 is new, as far as the author knows, but nearly everything else in this section will be known to experts in synthetic differential geometry, and much of it can be found in Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Ch. I], Dubuc [9–12] or Kock [23, §III]. We introduce some new notation for brevity, in particular, our *fair* C^∞ -rings are known in the literature as ‘finitely generated and germ determined C^∞ -rings’.

2.1 Two definitions of C^∞ -ring

We first define C^∞ -rings in the style of classical algebra.

Definition 2.1. A C^∞ -ring is a set $\mathfrak{C}$ together with operations

$$\Phi_f : \mathfrak{C}^n = \mathfrak{C} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{C} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}$$

$\uparrow n \text{ copies} \quad \uparrow$

for all $n \geq 0$ and smooth maps $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where by convention when $n = 0$ we define $\mathfrak{C}^0$ to be the single point $\{\emptyset\}$. These operations must satisfy the following relations: suppose $m, n \geq 0$, and $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions. Define a smooth function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g(f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n)),$$

for all $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for all $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^n$ we have

$$\Phi_h(c_1, \dots, c_n) = \Phi_g(\Phi_{f_1}(c_1, \dots, c_n), \dots, \Phi_{f_m}(c_1, \dots, c_n)).$$

We also require that for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, defining $\pi_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\pi_j : (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto x_j$, we have $\Phi_{\pi_j}(c_1, \dots, c_n) = c_j$ for all $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^n$.

Usually we refer to $\mathfrak{C}$ as the C^∞ -ring, leaving the operations Φ_f implicit.

A *morphism* between C^∞ -rings $(\mathfrak{C}, (\Phi_f)_{f:\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} C^\infty)$, $(\mathfrak{D}, (\Psi_f)_{f:\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} C^\infty)$ is a map $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\Psi_f(\phi(c_1), \dots, \phi(c_n)) = \phi \circ \Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ for all smooth $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathfrak{C}$. We will write **C^∞ Rings** for the category of C^∞ -rings.

Here is the motivating example, which we will study at greater length in §3:

Example 2.2. Let X be a manifold, which may be without boundary, or with boundary, or with corners. Write $C^\infty(X)$ for the set of smooth functions $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For $n \geq 0$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth, define $\Phi_f : C^\infty(X)^n \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ by

$$(\Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n))(x) = f(c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)), \quad (2)$$

for all $c_1, \dots, c_n \in C^\infty(X)$ and $x \in X$. It is easy to see that $C^\infty(X)$ and the operations Φ_f form a C^∞ -ring.

Example 2.3. Take $X = \{0\}$ in Example 2.2. Then $C^\infty(\{0\}) = \mathbb{R}$, with operations $\Phi_f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\Phi_f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. This makes $\mathbb{R}$ into the simplest nonzero example of a C^∞ -ring.

Note that C^∞ -rings are far more general than those coming from manifolds. For example, if X is any topological space we could define a C^∞ -ring $C^0(X)$ to be the set of *continuous* $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with operations Φ_f defined as in (2). For X a manifold with $\dim X > 0$, the C^∞ -rings $C^\infty(X)$ and $C^0(X)$ are different.

There is a more succinct definition of C^∞ -rings using category theory:

Definition 2.4. Write **Euc** for the full subcategory of **Man** spanned by the Euclidean spaces $\mathbb{R}^n$. That is, the objects of **Euc** are the manifolds $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and the morphisms in **Euc** are smooth maps $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. Write **Sets** for the category of sets. In both **Euc** and **Sets** we have notions of (finite) products of objects (that is, $\mathbb{R}^{n+m} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, and products $S \times T$ of sets S, T), and products of morphisms. Define a (*category-theoretic*) C^∞ -ring to be a product-preserving functor $F : \mathbf{Euc} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$.

Here is how this relates to Definition 2.1. Suppose $F : \mathbf{Euc} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ is a product-preserving functor. Define $\mathfrak{C} = F(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\mathfrak{C}$ is an object in **Sets**, that is, a set. Suppose $n \geq 0$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth. Then f is a morphism in **Euc**, so $F(f) : F(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow F(\mathbb{R}) = \mathfrak{C}$ is a morphism in **Sets**. Since F preserves products $F(\mathbb{R}^n) = F(\mathbb{R}) \times \dots \times F(\mathbb{R}) = \mathfrak{C}^n$, so $F(f)$ maps $\mathfrak{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. We define $\Phi_f : \mathfrak{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ by $\Phi_f = F(f)$. The fact that F is a functor implies that the Φ_f satisfy the relations in Definition 2.1, so $(\mathfrak{C}, (\Phi_f)_{f:\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} C^\infty)$ is a C^∞ ring.

Conversely, if $(\mathfrak{C}, (\Phi_f)_{f:\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} C^\infty)$ is a C^∞ -ring then we define $F : \mathbf{Euc} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ by $F(\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathfrak{C}^n$, and if $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is smooth then $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ for $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth, and we define $F(f) : \mathfrak{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^m$ by $F(f) : (c_1, \dots, c_n) \mapsto (\Phi_{f_1}(c_1, \dots, c_n), \dots, \Phi_{f_m}(c_1, \dots, c_n))$. Then F is a product-preserving functor. This defines a 1-1 correspondence between C^∞ -rings in the sense of Definition 2.1, and category-theoretic C^∞ -rings in the sense of Definition 2.4.

Since all small colimits exist in **Sets** [27, Ex. V.1.8], regarding C^∞ -rings as functors $F : \mathbf{Euc} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ as in Definition 2.4, to take small colimits in the category of C^∞ -rings we can take colimits in **Sets** object-wise in **Euc**, so as in Moerdijk and Reyes [33, p. 21-22] we have:

Proposition 2.5. *In the category $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$ of C^∞ -rings, all small colimits exist, and so in particular pushouts and all finite colimits exist.*

In fact Proposition 2.5 holds for the category of models of any universal-algebra theory. We will write $\mathfrak{D} \amalg_{\phi, \mathfrak{C}, \psi} \mathfrak{E}$ or $\mathfrak{D} \amalg_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{E}$ for the pushout of morphisms $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}, \psi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. When $\mathfrak{C} = \mathbb{R}$, the initial object in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$, pushouts $\mathfrak{D} \amalg_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{E}$ are called *coproducts* and are usually written $\mathfrak{D} \otimes_{\infty} \mathfrak{E}$. (Note that for $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras A, B the coproduct is the tensor product $A \otimes B$.)

2.2 C^∞ -rings as commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras, and ideals

Every C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ has an underlying commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra:

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring. Then we may give $\mathfrak{C}$ the structure of a *commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra*. Define addition ‘+’ on $\mathfrak{C}$ by $c + c' = \Phi_f(c, c')$ for $c, c' \in \mathfrak{C}$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $f(x, y) = x + y$. Define multiplication ‘ $\cdot$ ’ on $\mathfrak{C}$ by $c \cdot c' = \Phi_g(c, c')$, where $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $g(x, y) = xy$. Define scalar multiplication by $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ by $\lambda c = \Phi_{\lambda'}(c)$, where $\lambda' : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $\lambda'(x) = \lambda x$. Define elements 0 and 1 in $\mathfrak{C}$ by $0 = \Phi_{0'}(\emptyset)$ and $1 = \Phi_{1'}(\emptyset)$, where $0' : \mathbb{R}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $1' : \mathbb{R}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the maps $0' : \emptyset \mapsto 0$ and $1' : \emptyset \mapsto 1$. The relations on the Φ_f imply that all the axioms of a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra are satisfied. In Example 2.2, this yields the obvious $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra structure on the smooth functions $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Here is another way to say this. In an $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra A , the n -fold ‘operations’ $\Phi : A^n \rightarrow A$, that is, all the maps $A^n \rightarrow A$ we can construct using only addition, multiplication, scalar multiplication, and the elements $0, 1 \in A$, correspond exactly to polynomials $p : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since polynomials are smooth, the operations of an $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra are a subset of those of a C^∞ -ring, and we can truncate from C^∞ -rings to $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras. As there are many more smooth functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ than there are polynomials, a C^∞ -ring has far more structure and operations than a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra.

Definition 2.7. An *ideal* I in $\mathfrak{C}$ is an ideal $I \subset \mathfrak{C}$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ regarded as a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra. Then we make the quotient $\mathfrak{C}/I$ into a C^∞ -ring as follows. If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, define $\Phi_f^I : (\mathfrak{C}/I)^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}/I$ by

$$(\Phi_f^I(c_1 + I, \dots, c_n + I))(x) = f(c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)) + I.$$

To show this is well-defined, we must show it is independent of the choice of representatives $c_1, \dots, c_n$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ for $c_1 + I, \dots, c_n + I$ in $\mathfrak{C}/I$. By Hadamard’s Lemma there exist smooth functions $g_i : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ with

$$f(y_1, \dots, y_n) - f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i) g_i(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

for all $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}$. If $c'_1, \dots, c'_n$ are alternative choices for $c_1, \dots, c_n$, so that $c'_i + I = c_i + I$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $c'_i - c_i \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(c'_1(x), \dots, c'_n(x)) - f(c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (c'_i - c_i) g_i(c'_1(x), \dots, c'_n(x), c_1(x), \dots, c_n(x)). \end{aligned}$$

The second line lies in I as $c'_i - c_i \in I$ and I is an ideal, so Φ_f^I is well-defined, and clearly $(\mathfrak{C}/I, (\Phi_f^I)_{f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} C^\infty)$ is a C^∞ -ring.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a C^∞ -ring, we will use the notation $(f_a : a \in A)$ to denote the ideal in $\mathfrak{C}$ generated by a collection of elements f_a , $a \in A$ in $\mathfrak{C}$, in the sense of commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras. That is,

$$(f_a : a \in A) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n f_{a_i} \cdot c_i : n \geq 0, a_1, \dots, a_n \in A, c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathfrak{C} \right\}.$$

Definition 2.8. A C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is called *finitely generated* if there exist $c_1, \dots, c_n$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ which generate $\mathfrak{C}$ over all C^∞ -operations. That is, for each $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ there exists smooth $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $c = \Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n)$. (Note that this is a much weaker condition than $\mathfrak{C}$ being finitely generated as a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra).

By Kock [23, Prop. III.5.1], $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the free C^∞ -ring with n generators. Given such $\mathfrak{C}, c_1, \dots, c_n$, define $\phi : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ by $\phi(f) = \Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ for smooth $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is as in Example 2.2 with $X = \mathbb{R}^n$. Then ϕ is a surjective morphism of C^∞ -rings, so $I = \text{Ker } \phi$ is an ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\mathfrak{C} \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$ as a C^∞ -ring. Thus, $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely generated if and only if $\mathfrak{C} \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$ for some $n \geq 0$ and ideal I in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

An ideal I in a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is called *finitely generated* if I is a finitely generated ideal of the underlying commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra of $\mathfrak{C}$ in Definition 2.6, that is, $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ for some $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \mathfrak{C}$. A C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is called *finitely presented* if $\mathfrak{C} \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$ for some $n \geq 0$, where I is a finitely generated ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Given such $\mathfrak{C}, n, I$, choose generators $i_1, \dots, i_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for I . Define $\psi : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^k) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $\psi(f)(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(i_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, i_k(x_1, \dots, x_n))$ for all smooth $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then ψ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings, and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^k) & \xrightarrow{x_1, \dots, x_k \mapsto 0} & C^\infty(\{0\}) \cong \mathbb{R} \\ \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow 1 \mapsto 1 \\ C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathfrak{C} \end{array} \quad (3)$$

is a pushout square in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. Conversely, $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented if it fits into a pushout square (3).

A difference with conventional algebraic geometry is that $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not noetherian, so ideals in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ may not be finitely generated, and $\mathfrak{C}$ finitely generated does not imply $\mathfrak{C}$ finitely presented.

Write $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$ and $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$ for the full subcategories of finitely generated and finitely presented C^∞ -rings in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$.

Example 2.9. A *Weil algebra* [9, Def. 1.4] is a finite-dimensional commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra W which has a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ with $W/\mathfrak{m} \cong \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^n = 0$ for some $n > 0$. Then by Dubuc [9, Prop. 1.5] or Kock [23, Th. III.5.3], there is a unique way to make W into a C^∞ -ring compatible with the given underlying commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra. This C^∞ -ring is finitely presented [23, Prop. III.5.11]. C^∞ -rings from Weil algebras are important in synthetic differential geometry, in arguments involving infinitesimals. See [6, §2] for a detailed study of this.

2.3 C^∞ -local rings, and localization

Definition 2.10. A C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is called a *C^∞ -local ring* if regarded as an $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra, as in Definition 2.6, $\mathfrak{C}$ is a local $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra with residue field $\mathbb{R}$. That is, $\mathfrak{C}$ has a unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ with $\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{C}} \cong \mathbb{R}$.

If $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}$ are C^∞ -local rings with maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{D}}$, and $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ is a morphism of C^∞ rings, then using the fact that $\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{C}} \cong \mathbb{R} \cong \mathfrak{D}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{D}}$ we see that $\phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{D}}) = \mathfrak{m}_{\mathfrak{C}}$, that is, ϕ is a *local* morphism of C^∞ -local rings. Thus, there is no difference between morphisms and local morphisms.

Remark 2.11. We use the term ‘ C^∞ -local ring’ following Dubuc [10, Def. 2.13], though they are also called ‘local C^∞ -rings’ in Dubuc [11, Def. 4]. Following [10, 11], we include the condition that $\mathfrak{C}$ has residue field $\mathbb{R}$ in the definition of C^∞ -local ring. Moerdijk and Reyes [31–33] omit this condition. They call local C^∞ -rings with residue field $\mathbb{R}$ *pointed local C^∞ -rings* in [33, §I.3] and *Archimedean local C^∞ -rings* in [31, §3].

Localizations of C^∞ -rings are studied in [10, 11, 31, 32], see [33, p. 23].

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring and S a subset of $\mathfrak{C}$. A *localization* $\mathfrak{C}[s^{-1} : s \in S]$ of $\mathfrak{C}$ at S is a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{C}[s^{-1} : s \in S]$ and a morphism $\pi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\pi(s)$ is invertible in $\mathfrak{D}$ for all $s \in S$, with the universal property that if $\mathfrak{E}$ is a C^∞ -ring and $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ a morphism with $\phi(s)$ invertible in $\mathfrak{E}$ for all $s \in S$, then there is a unique morphism $\psi : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ with $\phi = \psi \circ \pi$.

A localization $\mathfrak{C}[s^{-1} : s \in S]$ always exists — it can be constructed by adjoining an extra generator s^{-1} and an extra relation $s \cdot s^{-1} - 1 = 0$ for each $s \in S$ — and is unique up to unique isomorphism. When $S = \{c\}$ we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\infty} C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}] \rightarrow 0$, where $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\infty} C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is the coproduct of $\mathfrak{C}, C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ as in §2.1, with pushout morphisms $\iota_1 : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\infty} C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\iota_2 : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\infty} C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, and I is the ideal in $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\infty} C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ generated by $\iota_1(c) \cdot \iota_2(x) - 1$, where x is the generator of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

An $\mathbb{R}$ -*point* p of a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is a C^∞ -ring morphism $p : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{R}$ is regarded as a C^∞ -ring as in Example 2.3. By [33, Prop. I.3.6], a map $p : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings if and only if it is a morphism of the underlying $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras, as in Definition 2.7. Define $\mathfrak{C}_p$ to be the localization $\mathfrak{C}_p = \mathfrak{C}[s^{-1} : s \in \mathfrak{C}, p(s) \neq 0]$, with projection $\pi_p : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_p$. Then $\mathfrak{C}_p$ is a C^∞ -local ring by [33, Lem. 1.1]. The $\mathbb{R}$ -points of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are just evaluation at points $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Example 2.13. For $n \geq 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to be the set of germs of smooth functions $c : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, made into a C^∞ -ring in the obvious way. Then $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a *local* C^∞ -ring in the sense of Definition 2.10. Here are three different ways to define $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which yield isomorphic C^∞ -rings:

- (a) Defining $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as the germs of functions of smooth functions at p means that points of $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are $\sim$ -equivalence classes $[(U, c)]$ of pairs (U, c) , where $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is open with $p \in U$ and $c : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, and $(U, c) \sim (U', c')$ if there exists $p \in V \subseteq U \cap U'$ open with $c|_V \equiv c'|_V$.
- (b) As the localization $(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))_p = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)[g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) : g(p) \neq 0]$. Then points of $(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n))_p$ are equivalence classes $[f/g]$ of fractions f/g for $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $g(p) \neq 0$, and fractions $f/g, f'/g'$ are equivalent if there exists $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $h(p) \neq 0$ and $h(fg' - f'g) \equiv 0$.
- (c) As the quotient $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$, where I is the ideal of $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $f \equiv 0$ near $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

One can show (a)–(c) are isomorphic using the fact that if U is any open neighbourhood of p in $\mathbb{R}^n$ then there exists smooth $\eta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\eta \equiv 0$ on an open neighbourhood of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus U$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\eta \equiv 1$ on an open neighbourhood of p in U . Any finitely generated C^∞ -local ring is a quotient of some $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

2.4 Fair C^∞ -rings

We now discuss an important class of C^∞ -rings, which we call *fair* C^∞ -rings. Although our term ‘fair’ is new, we stress that the idea is already well-known, being originally introduced by Dubuc [10], [11, Def. 11], who first recognized their significance, under the name ‘ C^∞ -rings of finite type presented by an ideal of local character’, and in more recent works would be referred to as ‘finitely generated and germ-determined C^∞ -rings’. We chose the term ‘fair’ for its brevity, as we will be using it a lot; the intention is to suggest that ‘fair’ C^∞ -rings are well behaved and nicer to work with than general C^∞ -rings, but ‘good’ C^∞ -rings in §2.5 are even better.

Definition 2.14. An ideal I in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is called *fair* if for each $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, f lies in I if and only if $\pi_p(f)$ lies in $\pi_p(I) \subseteq C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is as in Example 2.13 and $\pi_p : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the natural projection $\pi_p : c \mapsto [(\mathbb{R}^n, c)]$. A C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is called *fair* if it is isomorphic to $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$, where I is a fair ideal. Equivalently, $\mathfrak{C}$ is fair if it is finitely generated and whenever $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ with $\pi_p(c) = 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}_p$ for all $\mathbb{R}$ -points $p : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then $c = 0$, using the notation of Definition 2.12.

Dubuc [10], [11, Def. 11] calls fair ideals *ideals of local character*, and Mordijk and Reyes [33, I.4] call them *germ determined*, which has now become the accepted term. Fair C^∞ -rings are also sometimes called *germ determined C^∞ -rings*, a more descriptive term than ‘fair’, but the definition of germ determined C^∞ -rings $\mathfrak{C}$ in [33, Def. I.4.1] does not require $\mathfrak{C}$ finitely generated, so does not equate exactly to our fair C^∞ -rings. By Dubuc [10, Prop. 1.8], [11, Prop. 12]

any finitely generated ideal I is fair, so $\mathfrak{C}$ finitely presented implies $\mathfrak{C}$ fair. We write $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ for the full subcategory of fair C^∞ -rings in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$.

Since $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$ is fair if and only if I is fair, we have:

Lemma 2.15. *Let $I \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $J \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be ideals with $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)/I \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/J$ as C^∞ -rings. Then I is fair if and only if J is fair.*

Recall from category theory that if $\mathcal{C}$ is a subcategory of a category $\mathcal{D}$, a *reflection* $R : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a left adjoint to the inclusion $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. That is, $R : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a functor with natural isomorphisms $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(R(D), C) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(D, C)$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$. We will define a reflection for $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}} \subset \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$, following Moerdijk and Reyes [33, p. 48-49] (see also Dubuc [11, Th. 13]).

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a finitely generated C^∞ -ring. Let $I_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the ideal of all $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $\pi_p(c) = 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}_p$ for all $\mathbb{R}$ -points $p : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then $c = 0$. Then $\mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is a finitely generated C^∞ -ring, with projection $\pi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}}$. It has the same $\mathbb{R}$ -points as $\mathfrak{C}$, that is, morphisms $p : \mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are in 1-1 correspondence with morphisms $p' : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $p' = p \circ \pi$, and the local rings $(\mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}})_p$ and $\mathfrak{C}_{p'}$ are naturally isomorphic. It follows that $\mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is *fair*. Define a functor $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ by $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}}$ on objects, and if $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ is a morphism then $\phi(I_{\mathfrak{C}}) \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{D}}$, so ϕ induces a morphism $\phi_* : \mathfrak{C}/I_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}/I_{\mathfrak{D}}$, and we set $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\phi) = \phi_*$. It is easy to see $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}$ is a *reflection*.

If I is an ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, write $\bar{I}$ for the set of $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\pi_p(f) \in \pi_p(I)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\bar{I}$ is the smallest fair ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ containing I , the *germ-determined closure* of I , and $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I) \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/\bar{I}$.

Example 2.17. Let $\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be smooth with $\eta(x) > 0$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ and $\eta(x) = 0$ for $x \notin (0, 1)$. Define $I \subseteq C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$I = \left\{ \sum_{a \in A} g_a(x) \eta(x - a) : A \subset \mathbb{Z} \text{ is finite, } g_a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), a \in A \right\}.$$

Then I is an ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, so $\mathfrak{C} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/I$ is a C^∞ -ring. The set of $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\pi_p(f)$ lies in $\pi_p(I) \subseteq C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\bar{I} = \left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} g_a(x) \eta(x - a) : g_a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), a \in \mathbb{Z} \right\},$$

where the sum $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} g_a(x) \eta(x - a)$ makes sense as at most one term is nonzero at any point $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\bar{I} \neq I$, we see that I is *not fair*, so $\mathfrak{C} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/I$ is *not a fair C^∞ -ring*. In fact $\bar{I}$ is the smallest fair ideal containing I . We have $I_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/I} = \bar{I}/I$, and $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/I) = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/\bar{I}$.

2.5 Good C^∞ -rings

The following class of ideals in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined by Moerdijk and Reyes [33, p. 47, p. 49] (see also Dubuc [10, §1.7(a)]), who call them *flat ideals*:

Definition 2.18. Let X be a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Define $\mathfrak{m}_X^\infty$ to be the ideal of all functions $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\partial^k g|_X \equiv 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, that is, g and

all its derivatives vanish at each $x \in X$. If the interior X° of X in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is dense in X , that is $\overline{(X^\circ)} = X$, then $\partial^k g|_X \equiv 0$ for all $k \geq 0$ if and only if $g|_X \equiv 0$. In this case $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/\mathfrak{m}_X^\infty \cong C^\infty(X) := \{f|_X : f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$.

Here is an example from Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Th. I.1.3].

Example 2.19. Take X to be the point $\{0\}$. If $f, f' \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ then $f - f'$ lies in $\mathfrak{m}_{\{0\}}^\infty$ if and only if f, f' have the same Taylor series at 0. Thus $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/\mathfrak{m}_{\{0\}}^\infty$ is the C^∞ -ring of Taylor series at 0 of $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since any formal power series in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is the Taylor series of some $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/\mathfrak{m}_{\{0\}}^\infty \cong \mathbb{R}[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$. Thus the $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra of formal power series $\mathbb{R}[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ can be made into a C^∞ -ring.

The following nontrivial result is proved by Reyes and van Quê [37, Th. 1], generalizing an unpublished result of A.P. Calderón in the case $X = Y = \{0\}$. It can also be found in Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Cor. I.4.12].

Proposition 2.20. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ and $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed. Then as ideals in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n})$ we have $(\mathfrak{m}_X^\infty, \mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty) = \mathfrak{m}_{X \times Y}^\infty$.*

The next definition is new, so far as the author knows.

Definition 2.21. An ideal I in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is called *good* if it is of the form $I = (f_1, \dots, f_k, \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty)$ for some $f_1, \dots, f_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and closed $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. A C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is called *good* if $\mathfrak{C} \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/I$ for some $n \geq 0$, where I is a good ideal. If I is finitely generated, then taking $X = \emptyset$ shows that I is good. If I is good then Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Cor. I.4.9] implies that I is fair.

Good C^∞ -rings have the following nice properties:

- (a) If X is a manifold, possibly with boundary or with corners, then $C^\infty(X)$ is a good C^∞ -ring, as in §3.
- (b) Good C^∞ -rings are closed under finite colimits in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$, as in §2.6.
- (c) The *spectrum functor* Spec from C^∞ -rings to affine C^∞ -schemes is full and faithful on good C^∞ -rings, as in §4.
- (d) The *cotangent module* $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ of a good C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is a finitely presented $\mathfrak{C}$ -module, as in §5.

Finitely presented C^∞ -rings do not satisfy (a), fair C^∞ -rings do not satisfy (b),(d), and finitely generated or arbitrary C^∞ -rings do not satisfy (c),(d). Write $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$ for the full subcategory of good C^∞ -rings in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. Then

$$\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}} \subset \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}} \subset \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}} \subset \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}} \subset \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}.$$

Here is an analogue of Lemma 2.15.

Proposition 2.22. *Suppose $I \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $J \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are ideals with $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)/I \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/J$ as C^∞ -rings. Then I is good, or finitely generated, if and only if J is good, or finitely generated, respectively.*

Proof. Write $\phi : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)/I \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/J$ for the isomorphism, and $x_1, \dots, x_m$ for the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and $y_1, \dots, y_n$ for the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since ϕ is an isomorphism we can choose $f_1, \dots, f_m \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\phi(x_i + I) = f_i + J$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $g_1, \dots, g_n \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\phi(g_i + I) = y_i + J$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Write $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x_i + I) &= f_i + J = \Phi_{f_i}(y_1, \dots, y_n) + J = \Phi_{f_i}(y_1 + J, \dots, y_n + J) \\ &= \Phi_{f_i}(\phi(g_1 + I), \dots, \phi(g_n + I)) = \phi(\Phi_{f_i}(g_1, \dots, g_n) + I),\end{aligned}$$

since ϕ and the projections $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)/I$, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/J$ are morphisms of C^∞ -rings. So as ϕ is injective we see that

$$x_i - \Phi_{f_i}(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in I \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (4)$$

As I is the kernel of $\phi \circ \pi : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/J$ we see that

$$I = \{e \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) : \Phi_e(f_1, \dots, f_m) \in J\}. \quad (5)$$

Let K be the ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ generated by $x_i - \Phi_{f_i}(g_1, \dots, g_n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then $K \subseteq I$ by (4). Let $e \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}e + K &= \Phi_e(x_1, \dots, x_m) + K = \Phi_e(x_1 + K, \dots, x_m + K) \\ &= \Phi_e(\Phi_{f_1}(g_1, \dots, g_n) + K, \dots, \Phi_{f_m}(g_1, \dots, g_n) + K) \\ &= \Phi_e(\Phi_{f_1}(g_1, \dots, g_n), \dots, \Phi_{f_m}(g_1, \dots, g_n)) + K \\ &= \Phi_{\Phi_e(f_1, \dots, f_m)}(g_1, \dots, g_n) + K.\end{aligned}$$

So by (5), if $e \in I$ then $e + K = \Phi_h(g_1, \dots, g_n) + K$ for some $h \in J$. Conversely, if $h \in J$ then $\mathbf{g}^*(h) = \Phi_h(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in I$. Hence

$$I = (x_i - \Phi_{f_i}(g_1, \dots, g_n), i = 1, \dots, m, \text{ and } \mathbf{g}^*(h), h \in J). \quad (6)$$

Suppose J is good, so that $J = (h_1, \dots, h_l, \mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty)$ for some $h_1, \dots, h_l \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and closed $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Define $X = \mathbf{g}^{-1}(Y)$, a closed subset in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Using Proposition 2.20, one can show that the ideal $(\mathbf{g}^*(\mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty))$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ generated by $\mathbf{g}^*(\mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty)$ is $\mathfrak{m}_X^\infty$. Therefore (6) gives

$$I = (x_i - \Phi_{f_i}(g_1, \dots, g_n), i = 1, \dots, m, \mathbf{g}^*(h_j), \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, l, \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty),$$

so I is good. Conversely, if I is good then J is good. If J is finitely generated we take $Y = \emptyset$, and then I is finitely generated, and vice versa. $\square$

Example 2.23. The C^∞ -local ring $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of Example 2.13 is the quotient of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by the ideal I of functions f with $f \equiv 0$ near $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For $n > 0$ this I is fair, but not good. So $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is fair, but not good, by Proposition 2.22.

Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Cor. I.4.19] prove:

Proposition 2.24. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed with $X \neq \emptyset, \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the ideal $\mathfrak{m}_X^\infty$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not countably generated.*

Hence *good ideals need not be finitely generated*. With Proposition 2.22, this implies that *good C^∞ -rings need not be finitely presented*.

Proposition 2.25. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring, $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, and $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ be the localization of $\mathfrak{C}$ at c . If $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented, or good, then $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ is finitely presented, or good, respectively.*

Proof. There is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$ as $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely generated in both cases. Write $x_1, \dots, x_n$ for the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and let $c = \phi(e)$ for $e \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow J \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}] \rightarrow 0$, where if we write the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ as $x_1, \dots, x_n, y$, then $J = (ye(x_1, \dots, x_n) - 1, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) : f \in I)$. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is good then $I = (f_1, \dots, f_k, \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty)$ for some closed $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Proposition 2.20 then yields

$$J = (ye(x_1, \dots, x_n) - 1, f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, f_k(x_1, \dots, x_n), \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}_{X \times \mathbb{R}}^\infty),$$

where $X \times \mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is closed. Hence $J, \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ are good. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented we take $X = \emptyset$, and then $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ is finitely presented. $\square$

However, the following example taken from Dubuc [12, Ex. 7.2] shows that localizations of fair C^∞ -rings need not be fair:

Example 2.26. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the C^∞ -local ring $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, as in Example 2.13. Then $\mathfrak{C} \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/I$, where I is the ideal of all $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $f \equiv 0$ near 0 in $\mathbb{R}$. This I is fair, so $\mathfrak{C}$ is fair. Let $c = [(x, \mathbb{R})] \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then the localization $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ is the C^∞ -ring of germs at 0 in $\mathbb{R}$ of smooth functions $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Taking $y = x^{-1}$ as a generator of $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$, we see that $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}] \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/J$, where J is the ideal of compactly supported functions in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. This J is not fair, so by Lemma 2.15, $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ is not fair.

2.6 Pushouts of C^∞ -rings

Proposition 2.5 shows that pushouts of C^∞ -rings exist. For finitely generated C^∞ -rings, we can describe these pushouts explicitly.

Example 2.27. Suppose the following is a pushout diagram of C^∞ -rings:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{C} & \xrightarrow{\quad \beta \quad} & \mathfrak{E} \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \delta \\ \mathfrak{D} & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathfrak{F}, \end{array}$$

so that $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{D} \amalg_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{E}$, with $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ finitely generated. Then we have exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow I \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0, \quad 0 \rightarrow J \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow 0, \\ \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow K \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\chi} \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where ϕ, ψ, χ are morphisms of C^∞ -rings, and I, J, K are ideals in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l)$, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Write $x_1, \dots, x_l$ and $y_1, \dots, y_m$ and $z_1, \dots, z_n$ for the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l)$, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ respectively. Then $\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_l)$ generate $\mathfrak{C}$, and $\alpha \circ \phi(x_1), \dots, \alpha \circ \phi(x_l)$ lie in $\mathfrak{D}$, so we may write $\alpha \circ \phi(x_i) = \psi(f_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$ as ψ is surjective, where $f_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth. Similarly $\beta \circ \phi(x_1), \dots, \beta \circ \phi(x_l)$ lie in $\mathfrak{E}$, so we may write $\beta \circ \phi(x_i) = \chi(g_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$, where $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth.

Then from the explicit construction of pushouts of C^∞ -rings we obtain an exact sequence with ξ a morphism of C^∞ -rings

$$0 \rightarrow L \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n}) \xrightarrow{\xi} \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow 0, \quad (8)$$

where we write the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n})$ as $y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n$, and then L is the ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n})$ generated by the elements $d(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ for $d \in J \subseteq C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and $e(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ for $e \in K \subseteq C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $f_i(y_1, \dots, y_m) - g_i(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$.

For the case of *coproducts* $\mathfrak{D} \otimes_\infty \mathfrak{E}$, with $\mathfrak{C} = \mathbb{R}$, $l = 0$ and $I = \{0\}$, we have

$$(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)/J) \otimes_\infty (C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/K) = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n})/(J, K).$$

Proposition 2.28. *The subcategories $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$ are closed under pushouts and all finite colimits in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$.*

Proof. First we show $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$ are closed under pushouts. Suppose $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ are finitely generated, and use the notation of Example 2.27. Then $\mathfrak{F}$ is finitely generated with generators $y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n$, so $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$ is closed under pushouts. Suppose $\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ are good. Then $J = (d_1, \dots, d_j, \mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty)$, $K = (e_1, \dots, e_k, \mathfrak{m}_Z^\infty)$ for $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ closed. Proposition 2.20 gives $(\mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty, \mathfrak{m}_Z^\infty) = \mathfrak{m}_{Y \times Z}^\infty$, so by Example 2.27 we have

$$L = (d_p(y_1, \dots, y_m), p = 1, \dots, j, e_p(z_1, \dots, z_n), p = 1, \dots, k, f_p(y_1, \dots, y_m) - g_p(z_1, \dots, z_n), p = 1, \dots, l, \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}_{Y \times Z}^\infty). \quad (9)$$

Thus L is good, so $\mathfrak{F}$ is good, and $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$ is closed under pushouts. For $\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ finitely presented we take $Y = Z = \emptyset$, and then L is finitely generated, and $\mathfrak{F}$ finitely presented, and $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$ is closed under pushouts.

Finally, note that $\mathbb{R}$ is an initial object in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$ and lies in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$ and $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$, and all finite colimits may be constructed by repeated pushouts possibly involving the initial object. Hence $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$ are closed under finite colimits. $\square$

Here is an example from Dubuc [12, Ex. 7.1], Moerdijk and Reyes [33, p. 49].

Example 2.29. Consider the coproduct $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_\infty C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, where $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is the C^∞ -ring of germs of smooth functions at 0 in $\mathbb{R}$ as in Example 2.13. Then $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ are fair C^∞ -rings, but $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is neither finitely presented nor

good. By Example 2.27, $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_\infty C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}) = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \amalg_{\mathbb{R}} C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)/L$, where L is the ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ generated by functions $f(x, y) = g(y)$ for $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $g \equiv 0$ near $0 \in \mathbb{R}$. This ideal L is not fair, since for example one can find $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $f(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $|xy| \leq 1$, and then $f \notin L$ but $\pi_p(f) \in \pi_p(L) \subseteq C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Hence $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_\infty C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is not a fair C^∞ -ring, by Lemma 2.15, and pushouts of fair C^∞ -rings need not be fair.

Our next result is referred to in the last part of Dubuc [11, Th. 13].

Proposition 2.30. $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ is not closed under pushouts in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. Nonetheless, pushouts and all finite colimits exist in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$, although they may not coincide with pushouts and finite colimits in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$.

Proof. Example 2.29 shows that $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ is not closed under pushouts in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. To construct finite colimits in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$, we first take the colimit in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}}$, which exists by Propositions 2.5 and 2.28, and then apply the reflection functor $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}$. By the universal properties of colimits and reflection functors, the result is a colimit in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$. $\square$

3 The C^∞ -ring $C^\infty(X)$ of a manifold X

We now study the C^∞ -rings $C^\infty(X)$ of manifolds X defined in Example 2.2. We are interested in *manifolds without boundary* (locally modelled on $\mathbb{R}^n$), and in *manifolds with boundary* (locally modelled on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$), and in *manifolds with corners* (locally modelled on $[0, \infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$). Manifolds with corners were considered by the author [20], and we use the conventions of that paper.

The C^∞ -rings of manifolds with boundary are discussed by Reyes [36] and Kock [23, §III.9], but Kock appears to have been unaware of Proposition 2.20, which makes C^∞ -rings of manifolds with boundary easier to understand.

If X, Y are manifolds with corners of dimensions m, n , then [20, §3] defined $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to be *weakly smooth* if f is continuous and whenever $(U, \phi), (V, \psi)$ are charts on X, Y then $\psi^{-1} \circ f \circ \phi : (f \circ \phi)^{-1}(\psi(V)) \rightarrow V$ is a smooth map from $(f \circ \phi)^{-1}(\psi(V)) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ to $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. A *smooth map* is a weakly smooth map f satisfying some complicated extra conditions over $\partial^k X, \partial^l Y$ in [20, §3]. If $\partial Y = \emptyset$ these conditions are vacuous, so for manifolds without boundary, weakly smooth maps and smooth maps coincide. Write $\mathbf{Man}, \mathbf{Man}^b, \mathbf{Man}^c$ for the categories of manifolds without boundary, and with boundary, and with corners, respectively, with morphisms smooth maps.

Example 3.1. Let $0 < k \leq n$, and consider the closed subset $\mathbb{R}_k^n = [0, \infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the local model for manifolds with corners. Write $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^n)$ for the C^∞ -ring $\{f|_{\mathbb{R}_k^n} : f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$. Since the interior $(\mathbb{R}_k^n)^\circ = (0, \infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ of $\mathbb{R}_k^n$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}_k^n$, as in Definition 2.18 we have $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^n) = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{R}_k^n}^\infty$. Hence $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^n)$ is a *good C^∞ -ring*, by Definition 2.21. Also, $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{R}_k^n}^\infty$ is not countably generated by Proposition 2.24, so it is not finitely generated, and thus $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^n)$ is not a *finitely presented C^∞ -ring* by Proposition 2.22.

Consider the coproduct $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^m) \otimes_\infty C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_l^n)$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$, that is, the pushout $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^m) \amalg_{\mathbb{R}} C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_l^n)$ over the trivial C^∞ -ring $\mathbb{R}$. By Example 2.27 and Proposition 2.20 we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^m) \otimes_\infty C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_l^n) &\cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n}) / (\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{R}_k^m}^\infty, \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{R}_l^n}^\infty) = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n}) / \mathfrak{m}_{\mathbb{R}_k^m \times \mathbb{R}_l^n}^\infty \\ &= C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^m \times \mathbb{R}_l^n) \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{k+l}^{m+n}). \end{aligned}$$

This is an example of Theorem 3.6 below, with $X = \mathbb{R}_k^m$, $Y = \mathbb{R}_l^n$ and $Z = \{0\}$.

Proposition 3.2. (a) *If X is a manifold without boundary then the C^∞ -ring $C^\infty(X)$ of Example 2.2 is finitely presented.*

(b) *If X is a manifold with boundary, or with corners, and $\partial X \neq \emptyset$, then the C^∞ -ring $C^\infty(X)$ of Example 2.2 is good, but is not finitely presented.*

Proof. Part (a) is proved in Dubuc [11, p. 687] and Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Th. I.2.3] following an observation of Lawvere, that if X is a manifold without boundary then we can choose a closed embedding $i : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ for $N \gg 0$, and then X is a retract of an open neighbourhood U of $i(X)$, so we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \xrightarrow{i^*} C^\infty(X) \rightarrow 0$ in which the ideal I is finitely generated, and thus the C^∞ -ring $C^\infty(X)$ is finitely presented.

For (b), if X is an n -manifold with boundary, or with corners, then we can embed X as a closed subset in an n -manifold X' without boundary, such that the inclusion $X \hookrightarrow X'$ is locally modelled on the inclusion of $\mathbb{R}_k^n = [0, \infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $k \leq n$. We can take X' diffeomorphic to the interior X° of X . Choose a closed embedding $i : X' \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ for $N \gg 0$ as above, giving $0 \rightarrow I' \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \xrightarrow{i^*} C^\infty(X') \rightarrow 0$ with I' generated by $f_1, \dots, f_k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The interior X° of X is open in X' , so there exists an open subset U in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $i(X^\circ) = U \cap i(X')$. Therefore $i(X) = \bar{U} \cap i(X')$.

Let I be the good ideal $(f_1, \dots, f_k, \mathfrak{m}_{\bar{U}}^\infty)$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Since U is open in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and dense in $\bar{U}$, as in Definition 2.18 we have $g \in \mathfrak{m}_{\bar{U}}^\infty$ if and only if $g|_{\bar{U}} \equiv 0$. Therefore the isomorphism $(i_*)_* : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)/I' \rightarrow C^\infty(X')$ identifies the ideal I/I' in $C^\infty(X')$ with the ideal of $f \in C^\infty(X')$ such that $f|_X \equiv 0$, since $X = i^{-1}(\bar{U})$. Hence

$$C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)/I \cong C^\infty(X') / \{f \in C^\infty(X') : f|_X \equiv 0\} \cong \{f|_X : f \in C^\infty(X')\} \cong C^\infty(X).$$

As I is a good ideal, this implies that $C^\infty(X)$ is a good C^∞ -ring. If $\partial X \neq \emptyset$ then using Proposition 2.24 we can show I is not countably generated, so $C^\infty(X)$ is not finitely presented by Proposition 2.22. $\square$

Next we consider the transformation $X \mapsto C^\infty(X)$ as a functor.

Definition 3.3. Write $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings})^{\text{op}}$, $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}})^{\text{op}}$, $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}})^{\text{op}}$ for the opposite categories of $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}}$ (i.e. directions

of morphisms are reversed). Define functors

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}} &: \mathbf{Man} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\mathbf{fp}})^{\mathbf{op}} \subset (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings})^{\mathbf{op}}, \\ F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}} &: \mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\mathbf{go}})^{\mathbf{op}} \subset (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings})^{\mathbf{op}}, \\ F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}} &: \mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}} \longrightarrow (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\mathbf{go}})^{\mathbf{op}} \subset (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings})^{\mathbf{op}} \end{aligned}$$

as follows. On objects the functors $F_{\mathbf{Man}^*}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}$ map $X \mapsto C^\infty(X)$, where $C^\infty(X)$ is a C^∞ -ring as in Example 2.2. On morphisms, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a smooth map of manifolds then $f^* : C^\infty(Y) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ mapping $c \mapsto c \circ f$ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings, so that $f^* : C^\infty(Y) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ is a morphism in $\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}$, and $f^* : C^\infty(X) \rightarrow C^\infty(Y)$ a morphism in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings})^{\mathbf{op}}$, and $F_{\mathbf{Man}^*}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}$ map $f \mapsto f^*$. Clearly $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}, F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}, F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}$ are functors.

If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is only *weakly smooth* then $f^* : C^\infty(Y) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ in Definition 3.3 is still a morphism of C^∞ -rings. From [33, Prop. I.1.5] we deduce:

Proposition 3.4. *Let X, Y be manifolds with corners. Then the map $f \mapsto f^*$ from weakly smooth maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to morphisms of C^∞ -rings $\phi : C^\infty(Y) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ is a 1-1 correspondence.*

Using the conventions of [20], in the category $\mathbf{Man}$ of manifolds without boundary, the morphisms are weakly smooth maps. So $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}$ is both injective on morphisms (faithful), and surjective on morphisms (full), as in Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Th. I.2.8]. But in $\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}$ the morphisms are smooth maps, a proper subset of weakly smooth maps, so the functors are injective but not surjective on morphisms. That is:

Corollary 3.5. *The functor $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}} : \mathbf{Man} \rightarrow (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\mathbf{fp}})^{\mathbf{op}}$ is full and faithful. However, the functors $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}} : \mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}} \rightarrow (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\mathbf{go}})^{\mathbf{op}}$ and $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}} : \mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}} \rightarrow (\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\mathbf{go}})^{\mathbf{op}}$ are faithful, but not full.*

Of course, if we defined $\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}$ to have morphisms weakly smooth maps, then $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}, F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}$ would be full and faithful. But this is not what we need for the applications in [22].

Let X, Y, Z be manifolds and $f : X \rightarrow Z, g : Y \rightarrow Z$ be smooth maps. If X, Y, Z are without boundary then f, g are called *transverse* if whenever $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ with $f(x) = g(y) = z \in Z$ we have $T_z Z = \mathrm{df}(T_x X) + \mathrm{dg}(T_y Y)$. If f, g are transverse then a fibre product $X \times_Z Y$ exists in $\mathbf{Man}$.

For manifolds with boundary, or with corners, the situation is more complicated, as explained in [20, §6]. In the definition of *smooth* $f : X \rightarrow Y$ we impose extra conditions over $\partial^j X, \partial^k Y$, and in the definition of transverse f, g we impose extra conditions over $\partial^j X, \partial^k Y, \partial^l Z$. With these more restrictive definitions of smooth and transverse maps, transverse fibre products exist in $\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}$ by [20, Th. 6.3]. The naïve definition of transversality is not a sufficient condition for fibre products to exist. Note too that a fibre product of manifolds with boundary may be a manifold with corners, so fibre products work best in $\mathbf{Man}$ or $\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{c}}$ rather than $\mathbf{Man}^{\mathbf{b}}$.

Our next theorem is given in [11, Th. 16] and [33, Prop. I.2.6] for manifolds without boundary, and the special case of products $\mathbf{Man} \times \mathbf{Man}^b \rightarrow \mathbf{Man}^b$ follows from Reyes [36, Th. 2.5], see also Kock [23, §III.9]. It can be proved by combining the usual proof in the without boundary case, the proof of [20, Th. 6.3], and Proposition 2.20.

Theorem 3.6. *The functors $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}, F_{\mathbf{Man}^c}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}}$ preserve transverse fibre products in $\mathbf{Man}, \mathbf{Man}^c$, in the sense of [20, §6]. That is, if the following is a Cartesian square of manifolds with g, h transverse*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & Y \\ \downarrow e & & \downarrow h \\ X & \xrightarrow{\quad g \quad} & Z, \end{array} \quad (10)$$

so that $W = X \times_{g,Z,h} Y$, then we have a pushout square of C^∞ -rings

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^\infty(Z) & \xrightarrow{\quad h^* \quad} & C^\infty(Y) \\ \downarrow g^* & & \downarrow f^* \\ C^\infty(X) & \xrightarrow{\quad e^* \quad} & C^\infty(W), \end{array} \quad (11)$$

so that $C^\infty(W) = C^\infty(X) \amalg_{g^*, C^\infty(Z), h^*} C^\infty(Y)$.

4 C^∞ -ringed spaces and C^∞ -schemes

In algebraic geometry, if A is an affine scheme and R the ring of regular functions on A , then we can recover A as the spectrum of the ring R , $A \cong \mathrm{Spec} R$. One of the ideas of synthetic differential geometry, as in [33, §I], is to regard a manifold M as the ‘spectrum’ of the C^∞ -ring $C^\infty(M)$ in Example 2.2. So we can try to develop analogues of the tools of scheme theory for smooth manifolds, replacing rings by C^∞ -rings throughout. This was done by Dubuc [10, 11]. The analogues of the algebraic geometry notions [17, §II.2] of ringed spaces, locally ringed spaces, and schemes, are called C^∞ -ringed spaces, local C^∞ -ringed spaces and C^∞ -schemes. Almost nothing in this section is really new, though we give more detail than our references in places.

4.1 C^∞ -ringed spaces and local C^∞ -ringed spaces

Definition 4.1. A C^∞ -ringed space $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a topological space X with a sheaf $\mathcal{O}_X$ of C^∞ -rings on X . That is, for each open set $U \subseteq X$ we are given a C^∞ ring $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$, and for each inclusion of open sets $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$ we are given a morphism of C^∞ -rings $\rho_{UV} : \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(V)$, called the *restriction maps*, and all this data satisfies the usual sheaf axioms [17, §II.1], [16, §0.3.1].

A *morphism* $\underline{f} = (f, f^\#) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ of C^∞ ringed spaces is a continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and a morphism $f^\# : \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow f_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ of sheaves of C^∞ -rings on Y . That is, for each open $U \subset Y$ we are given a morphism of

C^∞ -rings $f^\sharp(U) : \mathcal{O}_Y(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(f^{-1}(U))$ satisfying the obvious compatibilities with the restriction maps ρ_{UV} in $\mathcal{O}_X$ and $\mathcal{O}_Y$.

A *local C^∞ -ringed space* $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a C^∞ -ringed space for which the stalks $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ at x are C^∞ -local rings for all $x \in X$. As in Remark 2.11, since morphisms of C^∞ -local rings are automatically local morphisms, morphisms of local C^∞ -ringed spaces $(X, \mathcal{O}_X), (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ are just morphisms of C^∞ -ringed spaces, without any additional locality condition. Moerdijk et al. [31, §3] call our local C^∞ -ringed spaces *Archimedean C^∞ -spaces*.

Write $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ for the category of C^∞ -ringed spaces, and $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ for the full subcategory of local C^∞ -ringed spaces.

For brevity, we will use the notation that underlined upper case letters $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}, \dots$ represent C^∞ -ringed spaces $(X, \mathcal{O}_X), (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y), (Z, \mathcal{O}_Z), \dots$, and underlined lower case letters $\underline{f}, \underline{g}, \dots$ represent morphisms of C^∞ -ringed spaces $(f, f^\sharp), (g, g^\sharp), \dots$. When we write ' $x \in \underline{X}$ ' we mean that $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ and $x \in X$. When we write ' $\underline{U}$ is open in $\underline{X}$ ' we mean that $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$ and $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ with $U \subseteq X$ an open set and $\mathcal{O}_U = \mathcal{O}_X|_U$.

Example 4.2. Let X be a manifold, which may have boundary or corners. Define a C^∞ -ringed space $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ to have topological space X and $\mathcal{O}_X(U) = C^\infty(U)$ for each open subset $U \subseteq X$, where $C^\infty(U)$ is the C^∞ -ring of smooth maps $c : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and if $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$ are open we define $\rho_{UV} : C^\infty(U) \rightarrow C^\infty(V)$ by $\rho_{UV} : c \mapsto c|_V$.

It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{O}_X$ is a sheaf of C^∞ -rings on X (not just a presheaf), so $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a C^∞ -ringed space. For each $x \in X$, the stalk $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is the C^∞ -local ring of germs $[(c, U)]$ of smooth functions $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in X$, as in Example 2.13, with unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{X,x} = \{[(c, U)] \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x} : c(x) = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}/\mathfrak{m}_{X,x} \cong \mathbb{R}$. Hence $\underline{X}$ is a local C^∞ -ringed space.

Let X, Y be manifolds and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ a weakly smooth map. Define $(X, \mathcal{O}_X), (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ as above. For all open $U \subseteq Y$ define $f^\sharp(U) : \mathcal{O}_Y(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(f^{-1}(U)) = C^\infty(f^{-1}(U))$ by $f^\sharp(U) : c \mapsto c \circ f$ for all $c \in C^\infty(U)$. Then $f^\sharp(U)$ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings, and $f^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow f_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is a morphism of sheaves of C^∞ -rings on Y , so $\underline{f} = (f, f^\sharp) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is a morphism of (local) C^∞ -ringed spaces.

As the category $\mathbf{Top}$ of topological spaces has all finite limits, and the construction of $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ involves $\mathbf{Top}$ in a covariant way and the category $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$ in a contravariant way, using Proposition 2.5 one may prove:

Proposition 4.3. *All finite limits exist in the category $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$.*

Dubuc [11, Prop. 7] proves:

Proposition 4.4. *The full subcategory $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ of local C^∞ -ringed spaces in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ is closed under finite limits in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$.*

4.2 Affine C^∞ -schemes

We define a functor $\mathrm{Spec} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$, following Hartshorne [17, p. 70], Dubuc [10, 11], and Moerdijk, Qu   and Reyes [31].

Definition 4.5. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring, and use the notation of Definition 2.12. Write $X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ for the set of all $\mathbb{R}$ -points x of $\mathfrak{C}$. Then each $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ determines a map $c_* : X_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $c_* : x \mapsto x(c)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the smallest topology on $X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ such that $c_* : X_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous for all $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. That is, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is generated by the open sets $(c_*)^{-1}(U)$ for all $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ and open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then $X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is a topological space. It is Hausdorff, since if $x_1 \neq x_2 \in X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ then there exists $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ with $x_1(c) \neq x_2(c)$, and then $c_* : X_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and $c_*(x_1) \neq c_*(x_2)$.

For each open $U \subseteq X_{\mathfrak{C}}$, define $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}(U)$ to be the set of functions $s : U \rightarrow \coprod_{x \in U} \mathfrak{C}_x$ with $s(x) \in \mathfrak{C}_x$ for all $x \in U$, and such that U may be covered by open sets V for which there exist $c, d \in \mathfrak{C}$ with $x(d) \neq 0$ for all $x \in V$, with $s(x) = \pi_x(c)\pi_x(d)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{C}_x$ for all $x \in V$. Define operations Φ_f on $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}(U)$ pointwise in $x \in U$ using the operations Φ_f on $\mathfrak{C}_x$. This makes $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}(U)$ into a C^∞ -ring. If $V \subseteq U \subseteq X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ are open, the restriction map $\rho_{UV} : \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}(V)$ mapping $\rho_{UV} : s \mapsto s|_V$ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings.

It is then easy to see that $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}$ is a sheaf of C^∞ -rings on $X_{\mathfrak{C}}$. The stalk $\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}},x}$ at $x \in X$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}_x$, which is a C^∞ -local ring. Hence $(X_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}})$ is a local C^∞ -ringed space, which we call the *spectrum* of $\mathfrak{C}$, and write as $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$.

Now let $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ be a morphism of C^∞ -rings. Define $f_\phi : X_{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ by $f_\phi(x) = x \circ \phi$. Then f_ϕ is continuous. For $U \subseteq X_{\mathfrak{C}}$ open define $f_\phi^\sharp(U) : \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{D}}}(f_\phi^{-1}(U))$ by $f_\phi^\sharp(U)s : x \mapsto \phi_x(s(f_\phi(x)))$, where $\phi_x : \mathfrak{C}_{f_\phi(x)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}_x$ is the induced morphism of C^∞ -local rings. Then $f_\phi^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}} \rightarrow (f_\phi)_*(\mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{D}}})$ is a morphism of sheaves of C^∞ -rings on $X_{\mathfrak{C}}$, so $\underline{f}_\phi = (f_\phi, f_\phi^\sharp) : (X_{\mathfrak{D}}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{D}}}) \rightarrow (X_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}})$ is a morphism of local C^∞ -ringed spaces. Define $\text{Spec } \phi : \text{Spec } \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ by $\text{Spec } \phi = \underline{f}_\phi$. Then Spec is a functor $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$, which preserves limits by Dubuc [11, p. 687].

The *global sections functor* $\Gamma : \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{op}}$ acts on objects $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ by $\Gamma : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \mapsto \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ and on morphisms $(f, f^\sharp) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ by $\Gamma : (f, f^\sharp) \mapsto f^\sharp(Y)$. As in Dubuc [11, Th. 8] or Moerdijk et al. [31, Th. 3.2], Γ is a *left adjoint* to Spec , that is, for all $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$ and $\underline{X} \in \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ there are functorial isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}}(\mathfrak{C}, \Gamma(\underline{X})) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}}(\underline{X}, \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}). \quad (12)$$

For any C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ there is a natural morphism of C^∞ -rings $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C})$ corresponding to $\text{id}_{\underline{X}}$ in (12) with $\underline{X} = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$.

Remark 4.6. Our definition of the spectrum $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ agrees with Dubuc [10, 11], and with the *Archimedean spectrum* of [31, §3]. Moerdijk et al. [31, §1] give a different definition of the spectrum $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$, in which the points are not $\mathbb{R}$ -points, but ‘ C^∞ -radical prime ideals’.

Example 4.7. Let X be a manifold. It is easy to see that the local C^∞ -ringed space $\underline{X}$ constructed in Example 4.2 is naturally isomorphic to $\text{Spec } C^\infty(X)$.

Now suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is a finitely generated C^∞ -ring, with exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$. Define a map $\phi_* : X_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\phi_* : z \mapsto (z \circ$

$\phi(x_1), \dots, z \circ \phi(x_n))$, where $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then ϕ_* gives a homeomorphism

$$\phi_* : X_{\mathfrak{C}} \xrightarrow{\cong} X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in I\}, \quad (13)$$

where the right hand side is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. So the topological spaces in $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for finitely generated $\mathfrak{C}$ are homeomorphic to closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Comparing the definitions of Spec and the reflection $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}$, we can show:

Proposition 4.8. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring. Then $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C})$ is an isomorphism. More generally, if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a finitely generated C^∞ -ring then $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ is naturally isomorphic to $\text{Spec } R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C})$, using the notation of Definition 2.16, and $\Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C})$ is naturally isomorphic to $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C})$, and $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C})$ is identified with the natural surjective projection $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C})$.*

This is a contrast to conventional algebraic geometry, in which $\Gamma(\text{Spec } R) \cong R$ for arbitrary rings R , as in [17, Prop. II.2.2]. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is not finitely generated then $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C})$ need not be surjective, so $\Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C})$ can be larger than $\mathfrak{C}$. Proposition 4.8 shows that for general C^∞ -rings $\mathfrak{C}$ the functor Spec loses information about $\mathfrak{C}$, so Spec is neither full nor faithful, but for fair C^∞ -rings Spec loses no information up to isomorphism, so as in [11, Th. 13] we have:

Theorem 4.9. *The functor $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ is full and faithful. Hence $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$, $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ are also full and faithful, since $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}})^{\text{op}} \subset (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}})^{\text{op}} \subset (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}}$ are full subcategories.*

In the obvious way we define *affine C^∞ -schemes*.

Definition 4.10. A local C^∞ -ringed space $\underline{X}$ is called an *affine C^∞ -scheme* if it is isomorphic in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ to $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for some C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$. We call $\underline{X}$ a *finitely presented*, or *good*, or *fair*, affine C^∞ -scheme if $X \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for $\mathfrak{C}$ that kind of C^∞ -ring. Write $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}}$ for the full subcategories of affine C^∞ -schemes and of finitely presented, good, and fair, affine C^∞ -schemes in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ respectively. Then Theorem 4.9 implies that $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}}$ is an equivalence of categories, and similarly for $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}}$.

We did not define *finitely generated* affine C^∞ -schemes, because they coincide with fair affine C^∞ -schemes, as Proposition 4.8 implies.

Corollary 4.11. *Suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is a finitely generated C^∞ -ring. Then $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ is a fair affine C^∞ -scheme.*

Theorem 4.12. *The full subcategories $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}}$, $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are closed under all finite limits in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. Hence, fibre products and all finite limits exist in each of these subcategories.*

Proof. $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ is closed under small limits in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ as small limits exist in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings})^{\text{op}}$ by Proposition 2.20 and Spec preserves limits by [11, p. 687]. Fibre products and all finite limits exist in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}}$ by Proposition 2.30, although they may not coincide with fibre products and finite limits in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings})^{\text{op}}$. The subcategories $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}})^{\text{op}}, (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}})^{\text{op}}$ are closed under fibre products and finite limits in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings})^{\text{op}}$ by Proposition 2.28, and hence under fibre products and finite limits in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}}$. By Dubuc [11, Th. 13] the functor $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ preserves limits. (Here we mean limits in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}}$, rather than limits in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings})^{\text{op}}$.)

Let $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ be finitely presented, or good, or fair, affine C^∞ -schemes, and $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Z}, \underline{g} : \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ be morphisms in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. Then we have isomorphisms

$$\underline{X} \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}, \quad \underline{Y} \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{D}, \quad \underline{Z} \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{E} \quad \text{in } \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ are finitely presented, or good, or fair, C^∞ -rings, respectively. Since $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ is full and faithful by Theorem 4.9, there exist unique morphisms of C^∞ -rings $\phi : \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}, \psi : \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ such that (14) identifies $\underline{f}$ with $\text{Spec } \phi$ and $\underline{g}$ with $\text{Spec } \psi$. Then [11, Th. 13] implies that

$$\underline{X} \times_{\underline{f}, \underline{Z}, \underline{g}} \underline{Y} \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \times_{\text{Spec } \phi, \text{Spec } \mathfrak{E}, \text{Spec } \psi} \text{Spec } \mathfrak{D} \cong \text{Spec } (\mathfrak{C} \amalg_{\phi, \mathfrak{E}, \psi} \mathfrak{D}),$$

where $\mathfrak{C} \amalg_{\mathfrak{E}} \mathfrak{D}$ is the pushout in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ rather than in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. Then $\mathfrak{C} \amalg_{\mathfrak{E}} \mathfrak{D}$ is finitely presented, or good, or fair, respectively, since $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fp}})^{\text{op}}, (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{go}})^{\text{op}}$ are closed under fibre products in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}}$. Hence $\underline{X} \times_{\underline{f}, \underline{Z}, \underline{g}} \underline{Y}$ is finitely presented, or good, or fair, respectively, and $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}}$ are closed under fibre products in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. Since $\text{Spec } \mathbb{R}$ is a terminal object, we see that $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}}$ are also closed under finite limits in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. $\square$

Definition 4.13. Define functors

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}} \subset \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \\ F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man}^{\text{b}} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}} \subset \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \\ F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man}^{\text{c}} &\longrightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}} \subset \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \end{aligned}$$

by $F_{\mathbf{Man}^*}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} = \text{Spec} \circ F_{\mathbf{Man}^*}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}}$, in the notation of Definitions 3.3 and 4.5.

By Example 4.7, if X is a manifold with corners then $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}(X)$ is naturally isomorphic to the local C^∞ -ringed space $\underline{X}$ in Example 4.2.

If $X, Y, \dots$ are manifolds, or $f, g, \dots$ are (weakly) smooth maps, we may use $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \dots, \underline{f}, \underline{g}, \dots$ to denote $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}(X, Y, \dots, f, g, \dots)$. So for instance we will write $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $[0, \infty)$ for $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}([0, \infty))$.

By Corollary 3.5, Theorems 3.6 and 4.9 and $\text{Spec} : (\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ preserving fibre products, we find as in Dubuc [11, Th. 16]:

Corollary 4.14. $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fp}} \subset \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ is a full and faithful functor, and $F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{b}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man}^{\text{b}} \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}} \subset \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, F_{\mathbf{Man}^{\text{c}}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} :$

$\mathbf{Man}^c \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{go}} \subset \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are both faithful functors, but are not full. Also these functors take transverse fibre products in $\mathbf{Man}, \mathbf{Man}^c$ to fibre products in $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{fp}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{go}}$.

In Definition 2.8 we saw that a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented if and only if it fits into a pushout square (3) in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}$. Applying Spec , which preserves fibre products, implies:

Lemma 4.15. *A C^∞ -ringed space $\underline{X}$ is a finitely presented affine C^∞ -scheme if and only if it may be written as a fibre product in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{X} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \underline{\{0\}} \\ \downarrow & \searrow \phi & \downarrow 0 \\ \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbb{R}^k, \end{array}$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is a smooth map, and $0 : \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is the zero map.

Our next two results show that $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{fp}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{go}}$ and $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{fa}}$ are closed under taking open subsets.

Definition 4.16. Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a C^∞ -ringed space, and $U \subseteq X$ an open subset. A *characteristic function* for U is a morphism of C^∞ -ringed spaces $\underline{f} = (f, f^\sharp) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}})$ such that $U = \{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}$.

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring, and $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. Define $\lambda_c : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ by $\lambda_c(f) = \Phi_f(c)$ for all smooth $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then λ_c is a morphism of C^∞ -rings, so $\text{Spec } \lambda_c : \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \text{Spec } C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}})$ is a morphism of affine C^∞ -schemes. Hence if the C^∞ -ringed space $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ then elements $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ generate morphisms of C^∞ -ringed spaces $\underline{f}_c = \text{Spec}(\lambda_c) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The characteristic functions we consider will always be of this form for $c \in \mathfrak{C}$.

Proposition 4.17. *Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a fair affine C^∞ -scheme. Then every open $U \subseteq X$ admits a characteristic function.*

Proof. By definition $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} = (X_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}})$ for some finitely generated C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$, which fits into an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$. Thus X is homeomorphic to $X_{\mathfrak{C}}$, which is homeomorphic to the closed subset $X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ given in (13). Let $U \subseteq X$ be open, and U' be the open subset of $X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi$ identified with U by these homeomorphisms. As $X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi$ has the subspace topology, there exists an open $V' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with $U' = V' \cap X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi$.

Every open subset in $\mathbb{R}^n$ has a characteristic function, [33, Lem. I.1.4]. Hence there exists $f' \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $V' = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f'(x) \neq 0\}$. Definition 4.16 gives a morphism $\text{Spec } \lambda_{\phi(f')} : \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $(f, f^\sharp) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}})$ be the morphism identified with $\text{Spec } \lambda_{\phi(f')}$ by the isomorphism $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$. Then $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is identified with $f'|_{X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi} : X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the homeomorphisms $X \cong X_{\mathfrak{C}} \cong X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi$. As U is identified with $U' = \{x \in X_{\mathfrak{C}}^\phi : f'(x) \neq 0\}$, it follows that $U = \{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}$, so $(f, f^\sharp)$ is a characteristic function for U . $\square$

Proposition 4.18. *Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a finitely presented, or good, or fair, affine C^∞ -scheme, and $U \subseteq X$ be an open subset. Then $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$ is also a finitely presented, or good, or fair, affine C^∞ -scheme, respectively.*

Proof. As $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is fair, there exists a characteristic function $\underline{f} : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \underline{\mathbb{R}}$ for U by Proposition 4.17. Consider the fibre product

$$(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \times_{\underline{f}, \underline{\mathbb{R}}, \underline{i}} \underline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (15)$$

in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$, where $i : \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the inclusion, and $\underline{i} : \underline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \underline{\mathbb{R}}$ is the image morphism of affine C^∞ -schemes under $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}$. Since $\underline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\} \cong (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}})$, it follows on general grounds that (15) is isomorphic to $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$. But $\underline{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ are manifolds without boundary, so $\underline{\mathbb{R}}, \underline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$ lie in $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{fp}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{go}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\mathbf{fa}}$, which are closed under fibre products by Theorem 4.12. Thus if $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a finitely presented, or good, or fair, affine C^∞ -scheme then so is (15), and hence so is $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$. $\square$

Note that this is better than the situation in conventional algebraic geometry, where for instance $\mathbb{C}^2$ is an affine $\mathbb{C}$ -scheme, but its open subset $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is not an affine $\mathbb{C}$ -scheme. This is because characteristic functions need not exist for open subsets of affine $\mathbb{C}$ -schemes. The ideas of the last two propositions are illustrated by the following expression for the C^∞ -ring $C^\infty(U)$ for open $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, proved by Dubuc [10, Cor. 1.14], [11, Cor. 15] and Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Lem. I.1.4, Cor. I.2.2].

Example 4.19. Let U be an open subset in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then U has a characteristic function f , that is, there exists $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $U = f^{-1}(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$, and

$$C^\infty(U) \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}) / (x_{n+1}f(x_1, \dots, x_n) - 1).$$

For general affine C^∞ -schemes $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$, open subsets $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$ need not be affine C^∞ -schemes, but we can say the following. A *principal open subset* is one of the form $U_c = \{x \in X : x(c) \neq 0\}$ for some $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. They are closed under finite intersections, since $U_{c_1} \cap \dots \cap U_{c_n} = U_{c_1 \dots c_n}$. Also $(U_c, \mathcal{O}_X|_{U_c}) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$, so principal open subsets of affine C^∞ -schemes are affine. Since principal open subsets generate the topology on X , every open subset in X is a union of principal open subsets. Thus we deduce:

Lemma 4.20. *Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be an affine C^∞ -scheme, and $U \subseteq X$ an open subset. Then U can be covered by open subsets $V \subseteq U$ such that $(V, \mathcal{O}_X|_V)$ is an affine C^∞ -scheme.*

Our next result describes the sheaf of C^∞ -rings $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for $\mathfrak{C}$ a finitely generated C^∞ -ring. It is a version of [17, Prop. I.2.2(b)] in conventional algebraic geometry, and reduces to Moerdijk and Reyes [33, Prop. I.1.6] when $\mathfrak{C} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proposition 4.21. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a finitely generated C^∞ -ring, write $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$, and let $U \subseteq X$ be open. By Proposition 4.17 we may choose a characteristic function $\underline{f} : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for U of the form $\underline{f} = \text{Spec } \lambda_c$ for some $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}])$, in the notation of Definitions 2.12 and 2.16. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented, or good, then $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$.*

Proof. We have morphisms of C^∞ -rings $\lambda_c : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $i^* : C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$, and $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ are finitely presented C^∞ -rings by Proposition 3.2(a). So as Spec preserves limits in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}})^{\text{op}}$ we have

$$\text{Spec}(\mathfrak{C} \amalg_{\lambda_c, C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), i^*} C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \times_{\underline{f}, \mathbb{R}, i} \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \cong (U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U).$$

But $\mathfrak{C} \amalg_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R})} C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \cong \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ for formal reasons. Thus Proposition 4.8 gives $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong \Gamma((U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)) \cong R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}])$. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented, or good, then $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ is too by Proposition 2.25, so $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ is fair and $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]) = \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$, and therefore $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$. $\square$

4.3 Locally finite sums in fair C^∞ -rings

We discuss infinite sums in fair C^∞ -rings, broadly following Dubuc [12].

Definition 4.22. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring, and write $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$. Consider a formal expression $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$, where A is a (usually infinite) indexing set and $c_a \in \mathfrak{C}$. We say that $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$ is a *locally finite sum* if X can be covered by open sets $U \subseteq X$ such that for all but finitely many $a \in A$ we have $\pi_x(c_a) = 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}_x$ for all $x \in U$, or equivalently, $\rho_{XU} \circ \Phi_{\mathfrak{C}}(c_a) = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$.

If $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$ is a locally finite sum, we say that $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ is a *limit* of $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$, written $c = \sum_{a \in A} c_a$, if $\pi_x(c) = \sum_{a \in A} \pi_x(c_a)$ for all $x \in X$, where $\sum_{a \in A} \pi_x(c_a)$ makes sense as there are only finitely many nonzero terms. For general $\mathfrak{C}$ limits need neither exist, nor be unique. In $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, every locally finite sum $\sum_{i \in I} c_i$ has a unique limit, defined pointwise.

Suppose the topological space X is locally compact. (This is automatic if $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely generated, since X is homeomorphic to a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$.) Then we can express locally finite sums in terms of a *topology* on $\mathfrak{C}$. For each $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ and each compact subset $S \subseteq X$, define $\mathcal{U}_{c,S}$ to be the set of $c' \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $\pi_x(c') = \pi_x(c)$ in $\mathfrak{C}_x$ for all $x \in S$. We think of $\mathcal{U}_{c,S}$ as an open neighbourhood of c in $\mathfrak{C}$. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ have the topology with basis $\mathcal{U}_{c,S}$ for all c, S . Then $c = \sum_{a=1}^\infty c_a$ is equivalent to $c = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{a=1}^N c_a)$ in this topology on $\mathfrak{C}$.

Let $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. Define the *support* $\text{supp } c$ of c to be the set of $p \in X$ such that the projection $c_p = \pi_p(c)$ to the C^∞ -local ring $\mathfrak{C}_p$ in Definition 2.12 is nonzero. Then $\text{supp } c$ is closed in X . If $U \subseteq X$ is open, we say that $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ is *supported on* U if $\text{supp } c \subseteq U$.

Let $\{U_a : a \in A\}$ be an open cover of X . A *partition of unity in $\mathfrak{C}$ subordinate to $\{U_a : a \in A\}$* is $\{\eta_a : a \in A\}$ with $\eta_a \in \mathfrak{C}$ supported on U_a for $a \in A$, such that $\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a$ is a locally finite sum in $\mathfrak{C}$ with $\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a = 1$ in $\mathfrak{C}$.

If we just say $\{\eta_a : a \in A\}$ is a partition of unity in $\mathfrak{C}$, we mean that $\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a$ is a locally finite sum in $\mathfrak{C}$ with $\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a = 1$.

Following Dubuc [12], it is now easy to prove:

Proposition 4.23. (a) *An ideal I in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is fair if and only if it is closed under locally finite sums.*

(b) *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring. Then every locally finite sum $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ has a unique limit.*

(c) *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring, $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$, and $\{U_a : a \in A\}$ be an open cover of X . Then there exists a partition of unity $\{\eta_a : a \in A\}$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ subordinate to $\{U_a : a \in A\}$.*

4.4 General C^∞ -schemes

As in conventional algebraic geometry [17, §II.2], we define a C^∞ -scheme to be a local C^∞ -ringed space covered by affine C^∞ -schemes.

Definition 4.24. Let $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a local C^∞ -ringed space. We call $\underline{X}$ a C^∞ -scheme if X can be covered by open sets $U \subseteq X$ such that $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$ is an affine C^∞ -scheme. We call a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$ *locally fair*, or *locally good*, or *locally finitely presented*, if X can be covered by open $U \subseteq X$ with $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$ a fair, or good, or finitely presented, affine C^∞ -scheme, respectively.

We call a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$ *separated* if the underlying topological space X is Hausdorff. Affine C^∞ -schemes are always separated.

Write $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}$, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ for the full subcategories of locally fair, and locally good, and locally finitely presented, and all, C^∞ -schemes, respectively. Our categories of spaces so far are related as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathbf{Man} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{Man}^b & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{Man}^c & & \\
\downarrow F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} & & \downarrow F_{\mathbf{Man}^b}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} & & \downarrow F_{\mathbf{Man}^c}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} & & \\
\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{RS} \\
\downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset \\
\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}
\end{array}$$

Ordinary schemes are much more general than ordinary affine schemes, and central examples such as $\mathbb{CP}^n$ are not affine schemes. However, affine C^∞ -schemes are already general enough for many purposes, and constructions involving affine C^∞ -schemes often yield affine C^∞ -schemes. For example:

- All manifolds are affine C^∞ -schemes.
- If a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$ is Hausdorff and can be covered by finitely many fair affine C^∞ -schemes, one can show $\underline{X}$ is a fair affine C^∞ -scheme.
- Let $\underline{X}$ be a locally fair C^∞ -scheme with X Hausdorff and paracompact. Then one can prove $\underline{X}$ is an affine C^∞ -scheme.

From Proposition 4.18 and Lemma 4.20 we immediately deduce:

Proposition 4.25. *Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a locally finitely presented, locally good, locally fair, or general, C^∞ -scheme, and $U \subseteq X$ be open. Then $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$ is also a locally finitely presented, or locally good, or locally fair, or general, C^∞ -scheme, respectively.*

Here is the analogue of Theorem 4.12.

Theorem 4.26. *The full subcategories $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}$ and $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are closed under all finite limits in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. Hence, fibre products and all finite limits exist in each of these subcategories.*

Proof. We first show $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are closed under fibre products. Let $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$, $\underline{g} : \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ be morphisms in one of these categories and $\underline{W} = \underline{X}_{\underline{f}, \underline{Z}, \underline{g}} \underline{Y}$ be the fibre product in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$, with projections $\pi_{\underline{X}} : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{X}$, $\pi_{\underline{Y}} : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$. Write $\underline{W} = (W, \mathcal{O}_W)$, $\underline{f} = (f, f^\sharp)$, and so on. Let $w \in W$, and set $x = \pi_X(w) \in X$, $y = \pi_Y(w) \in Y$ and $z = f(x) = g(y) \in Z$. Choose $V \subseteq Z$ with $z \in V$ and $(V, \mathcal{O}_Z|_V)$ in $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ respectively. Then $f^{-1}(V)$ is open in X so $(f^{-1}(V), \mathcal{O}_X|_{f^{-1}(V)})$ lies in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ by Proposition 4.25. Thus we may choose $T \subseteq f^{-1}(V)$ open with $x \in T$ and $(T, \mathcal{O}_X|_T)$ in $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, and similarly we choose $U \subseteq g^{-1}(V)$ open with $y \in U$ and $(U, \mathcal{O}_Y|_U)$ in $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$.

Let $S = \pi_X^{-1}(T) \cap \pi_Y^{-1}(U)$. Then S is an open neighbourhood of w in W , and $(S, \mathcal{O}_W|_S) \cong (T, \mathcal{O}_X|_T) \times_{(V, \mathcal{O}_Z|_V)} (U, \mathcal{O}_Y|_U)$. But $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are closed under fibre products in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$ by Theorem 4.12, so $(S, \mathcal{O}_W|_S)$ lies in $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{go}}, \mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{fa}}$ or $\mathbf{AC}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ respectively. As W can be covered by S , $\underline{W}$ lies in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}$ or $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$. Hence $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are closed under fibre products in $\mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. They are also closed under finite limits, as in the proof of Theorem 4.12. $\square$

We can generalize the material in §4.3 on partitions of unity for fair C^∞ -rings and fair affine C^∞ -schemes to locally fair C^∞ -schemes.

Definition 4.27. Let $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a C^∞ -scheme. Consider a formal sum $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$, where A is an indexing set and $c_a \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ for $a \in A$. We say $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$ is a *locally finite sum on $\underline{X}$* if X can be covered by open $U \subseteq X$ such that for all but finitely many $a \in A$ we have $\rho_{XU}(c_a) = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$.

By the sheaf axioms for $\mathcal{O}_X$, if $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$ is a locally finite sum there exists a unique $c \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ such that for all open $U \subseteq X$ such that $\rho_{XU}(c_a) = 0$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ for all but finitely many $a \in A$, we have $\rho_{XU}(c) = \sum_{a \in A} \rho_{XU}(c_a)$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$, where the sum makes sense as there are only finitely many nonzero terms. We call c the *limit* of $\sum_{a \in A} c_a$, written $\sum_{a \in A} c_a = c$.

Let $c \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$. Define the *support* $\text{supp } c$ of c to be the set of $x \in X$ such that the projection c_x of c to the stalk $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$ at x is nonzero. Then $\text{supp } c$ is closed in X . If $U \subseteq X$ is open, we say that c is *supported in U* if $\text{supp } c \subseteq U$.

Let $\{U_a : a \in A\}$ be an open cover of X . A *partition of unity on $\underline{X}$ subordinate to $\{U_a : a \in A\}$* is $\{\eta_a : a \in A\}$ with $\eta_a \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ supported on U_a for $a \in A$, such that $\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a$ is a locally finite sum on $\underline{X}$ with $\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a = 1$.

Proposition 4.28. *Suppose $\underline{X}$ is a separated, paracompact, locally fair C^∞ -scheme, and $\{\underline{U}_a : a \in A\}$ an open cover of $\underline{X}$. Then there exists a partition of unity $\{\eta_a : a \in A\}$ on $\underline{X}$ subordinate to $\{\underline{U}_a : a \in A\}$.*

Proof. Since $\underline{X}$ is locally fair, each $\underline{U}_a$ is locally fair, so we can choose an open cover $\{\underline{U}_{ab} : b \in B_a\}$ of $\underline{U}_a$ for each $a \in A$ such that $\underline{U}_{ab}$ is a fair affine C^∞ -scheme. Let $C = \{(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B_a\}$. Then $\{U_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$ is an open cover of X , which is paracompact. Therefore we may choose a *locally finite refinement* $\{V_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$ of $\{U_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$. That is, $V_{ab} \subseteq U_{ab}$ is open for all a, b , and $\bigcup_{(a,b) \in C} V_{ab} = X$, and each $x \in X$ has an open neighbourhood W_x in X with $W_x \cap V_{ab} \neq \emptyset$ for only finitely many $(a, b) \in C$.

Fix $(a', b') \in C$. Then $X = V_{a'b'} \cup \bigcup_{(a', b') \neq (a, b) \in C} V_{ab}$. Therefore $X \setminus V_{a'b'}$ and $X \setminus (\bigcup_{(a', b') \neq (a, b) \in C} V_{ab})$ are disjoint closed subsets in X . As X is paracompact and Hausdorff it is a *normal* topological space, so these disjoint closed sets have disjoint open neighbourhoods in X . Hence we can choose open $V'_{a'b'} \subseteq X$ such that $X \setminus (\bigcup_{(a', b') \neq (a, b) \in C} V_{ab}) \subseteq V'_{a'b'}$ and $\overline{V'_{a'b'}} \cap (X \setminus V_{a'b'}) = \emptyset$, where $\overline{V'_{a'b'}}$ is the closure of $V'_{a'b'}$ in X . Taking complements shows that $\overline{V'_{a'b'}} \subseteq V_{a'b'} \subseteq U_{a'b'}$ and $V'_{a'b'} \cup \bigcup_{(a', b') \neq (a, b) \in C} V_{ab} = X$.

Thus, if we replace $V_{a'b'}$ by $V'_{a'b'} \subseteq V_{a'b'}$, then $\{V_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$ is still a locally finite refinement of $\{U_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$, which has the extra property that the closure $\overline{V'_{a'b'}}$ of $V'_{a'b'}$ in X lies in $U_{a'b'}$. By choosing a well-ordering $\prec$ of C and making V_{ab} smaller for $(a, b) \in C$ in this way in the order $\prec$, by transfinite induction we see that we can choose the locally finite refinement $\{V_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$ such that $\overline{V_{ab}} \subseteq U_{ab}$ for all $(a, b) \in C$.

Let $(a, b) \in C$. Then V_{ab} is open in the fair affine C^∞ -scheme $\underline{U}_{ab}$, so by Proposition 4.17 there exists a characteristic function $f_{ab} \in \mathcal{O}_X(U_{ab})$ for V_{ab} . That is, $f_{ab}(x) \neq 0$ for $x \in V_{ab}$ and $f_{ab}(x) = 0$ for $x \in U_{ab} \setminus V_{ab}$. The construction also implies that the support $\text{supp } f_{ab}$ of f_{ab} is $\overline{V_{ab}}$. Since the closures of V_{ab} in U_{ab} and X agree, we may extend f_{ab} by zero over $X \setminus U_{ab}$ to give a unique $g_{ab} \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ with $\rho_{XU_{ab}}(g_{ab}) = f_{ab}$ and $\text{supp } g_{ab} = \text{supp } f_{ab} = \overline{V_{ab}}$.

Consider the sum $\sum_{(a,b) \in C} g_{ab}^2$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$. It is locally finite as $\{V_{ab} : (a, b) \in C\}$ is locally finite and $\text{supp } g_{ab}^2 \subseteq \overline{V_{ab}}$. Thus $\sum_{(a,b) \in C} g_{ab}^2 = c$ for some unique $c \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$. If $x \in X$ then $x \in V_{ab}$ for some $(a, b) \in C$ as $\bigcup_{(a,b) \in C} V_{ab} = X$, so $g_{ab}(x) = f_{ab}(x) \neq 0$, and $g_{ab}(x)^2 > 0$. Therefore $c(x) = \sum_{(a,b) \in C} g_{ab}(x)^2 > 0$ for all $x \in X$. So c is invertible in $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$. Define $\eta_a \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ for each $a \in A$ by $\eta_a = c^{-1} \cdot \sum_{b \in B_a} g_{ab}^2$. This is a locally finite sum, and so well defined. As $\text{supp } g_{ab}^2 \subseteq \overline{V_{ab}} \subseteq U_{ab} \subseteq U_a$ for all $b \in B_a$, we see that $\text{supp } \eta_a \subseteq U_a$. Also

$$\sum_{a \in A} \eta_a = \sum_{a \in A} c^{-1} \cdot \sum_{b \in B_a} g_{ab}^2 = c^{-1} \cdot c = 1.$$

Thus $\{\eta_a : a \in A\}$ is a partition of unity on $\underline{X}$ subordinate to $\{\underline{U}_a : a \in A\}$. $\square$

5 Modules over C^∞ -rings

Next we discuss *modules* over C^∞ -rings. The author knows of no previous work on these, so all this section may be new, although much of it is a straightforward generalization of well known facts about modules over commutative rings.

5.1 Modules

Definition 5.1. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring. A *module* (M, μ) over $\mathfrak{C}$, or $\mathfrak{C}$ -*module*, is a module over $\mathfrak{C}$ regarded as a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra as in Definition 2.7. That is, M is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ equipped with a bilinear map $\mu : \mathfrak{C} \times M \rightarrow M$, satisfying $\mu(c_1 \cdot c_2, m) = \mu(c_1, \mu(c_2, m))$ and $\mu(1, m) = m$ for all $c_1, c_2 \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $m \in M$. A *morphism* $\alpha : (M, \mu) \rightarrow (M', \mu')$ of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules $(M, \mu), (M', \mu')$ is a linear map $\alpha : M \rightarrow M'$ such that $\alpha \circ \mu = \mu' \circ (\text{id}_{\mathfrak{C}} \times \alpha) : \mathfrak{C} \times M \rightarrow M'$. Then $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules form an *abelian category*, which we write as $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$. Often we write M for the $\mathfrak{C}$ -module, leaving μ implicit, and write $c \cdot m$ rather than $\mu(c, m)$.

Let W be a real vector space. Then we define a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module $(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W, \mu_W)$ by $\mu_W(c_1, c_2 \otimes w) = (c_1 \cdot c_2) \otimes w$ for $c_1, c_2 \in \mathfrak{C}$ and $w \in W$. A $\mathfrak{C}$ -module (M, μ) is called *free* if it is isomorphic to $(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W, \mu_W)$ in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ for some W . Note as in Example 5.5 below that if W is infinite-dimensional then free $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W$ may not be well-behaved, and not a useful idea in some problems.

A $\mathfrak{C}$ -module (M, μ) is called *finitely generated* if there is an exact sequence $(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n, \mu_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \rightarrow (M, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ for some $n \geq 0$. A $\mathfrak{C}$ -module (M, μ) is called *finitely presented* if there is an exact sequence $(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m, \mu_{\mathbb{R}^m}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n, \mu_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \rightarrow (M, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ for some $m, n \geq 0$. We write $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{fp}}$ for the full subcategory of finitely presented $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$.

If $E \rightarrow F \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ with E, F finitely presented (or more generally E finitely generated and F finitely presented) then G is finitely presented. This is because if $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow E \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ are exact, we can make an exact sequence $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^{l+m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, if E, G are finitely presented, then F is finitely presented. Hence $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{fp}}$ is closed under cokernels and extensions in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$. But it may not be closed under kernels, since $\mathfrak{C}$ may not be noetherian as a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra.

Now let $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ be a morphism of C^∞ -rings. If (M, μ) is a $\mathfrak{D}$ -module then $\phi^*(M, \mu) = (M, \mu \circ (\phi \times \text{id}_M))$ is a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module, and this defines a functor $\phi^* : \mathfrak{D}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$. However, ϕ^* is not very well-behaved, for instance it need not take finitely generated $\mathfrak{D}$ -modules to finitely generated $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules, and we will not use it. If (M, μ) is a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module then $\phi_*(M, \mu) = (M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D}, \mu_{\mathfrak{D}})$ is a $\mathfrak{D}$ -module, where $\mu_{\mathfrak{D}} = \mu_{\mathfrak{C}} \times \text{id}_{\mathfrak{D}} : \mathfrak{D} \times M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D} \cong \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D} \times M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D}$, and this induces a functor $\phi_* : \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}\text{-mod}$ which does take finitely generated or presented $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules to finitely generated or presented $\mathfrak{D}$ -modules.

Vector bundles E over manifolds X give examples of modules over $C^\infty(X)$.

Example 5.2. Let X be a manifold, which may have boundary or corners. Let $E \rightarrow X$ be a vector bundle, and $C^\infty(E)$ the vector space of smooth sections

e of E . Define $\mu_E : C^\infty(X) \times C^\infty(E) \rightarrow C^\infty(E)$ by $\mu_E(c, e) = c \cdot e$. Then $(C^\infty(E), \mu_E)$ is a $C^\infty(X)$ -module. If E is a trivial rank k vector bundle, $E \cong X \times \mathbb{R}^k$, then $(C^\infty(E), \mu_E) \cong (C^\infty(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^k, \mu_{\mathbb{R}^k})$, so $(C^\infty(E), \mu_E)$ is a free $C^\infty(X)$ -module.

Let $E, F \rightarrow X$ be vector bundles over X and $\lambda : E \rightarrow F$ a morphism of vector bundles. Then $\lambda_* : C^\infty(E) \rightarrow C^\infty(F)$ defined by $\lambda_* : e \mapsto \lambda \circ e$ is a morphism of $C^\infty(X)$ -modules.

Now let X, Y be manifolds and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ a (weakly) smooth map. Then $f^* : C^\infty(Y) \rightarrow C^\infty(X)$ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings. If $E \rightarrow Y$ is a vector bundle over Y , then $f^*(E)$ is a vector bundle over X . Under the functor $(f^*)_* : C^\infty(Y)\text{-mod} \rightarrow C^\infty(X)\text{-mod}$ of Definition 5.1, we see that $(f^*)_*(C^\infty(E)) = C^\infty(E) \otimes_{C^\infty(Y)} C^\infty(X)$ is isomorphic as a $C^\infty(X)$ -module to $C^\infty(f^*(E))$.

If $E \rightarrow X$ is any vector bundle over a manifold then by choosing sections $e_1, \dots, e_n \in C^\infty(E)$ for $n \gg 0$ such that $e_1|_x, \dots, e_n|_x$ span $E|_x$ for all $x \in X$ we obtain a surjective morphism of vector bundles $\psi : X \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow E$, whose kernel is another vector bundle F . By choosing another surjective morphism $\phi : X \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow F$ we obtain an exact sequence of vector bundles $X \times \mathbb{R}^m \xrightarrow{\phi} X \times \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\psi} E \rightarrow 0$, which induces an exact sequence of $C^\infty(X)$ -modules $C^\infty(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \xrightarrow{\phi_*} C^\infty(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\psi_*} C^\infty(E) \rightarrow 0$. Thus we deduce:

Lemma 5.3. *Let X be a manifold, which may have boundary or corners, and $E \rightarrow X$ be a vector bundle. Then the $C^\infty(X)$ -module $C^\infty(E)$ in Example 5.2 is finitely presented.*

5.2 Complete modules over fair C^∞ -rings

We now extend the ideas in §4.3 on infinite sums in C^∞ -rings to modules.

Definition 5.4. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring, and M a module over $\mathfrak{C}$. Write $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$. Consider a formal expression $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$, where A is a (usually infinite) indexing set and $m_a \in M$. We say that $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ is a *locally finite sum* if X can be covered by open sets $U \subseteq X$ such that for all but finitely many $a \in A$ we have $(\text{id}_M \otimes \pi_x)(m_a) = 0$ in $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C}_x$ for all $x \in U$, where $\text{id}_M \otimes \pi_x : M \cong M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C}_x$ is induced by the projection $\pi_x : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_x$.

If $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ is a locally finite sum, we say that $m \in M$ is a *limit* of $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$, written $m = \sum_{a \in A} m_a$, if $(\text{id}_M \otimes \pi_x)(m) = \sum_{a \in A} (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi_x)(m_a)$ for all $x \in X$, where the sum makes sense as there are only finitely many nonzero terms.

We say two locally finite sums $\sum_{a \in A} m_a, \sum_{a \in A'} m'_a$ are *equivalent* if for all $x \in X$ we have $\sum_{a \in A} (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi_x)(m_a) = \sum_{a \in A'} (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi_x)(m'_a)$ in $\mathfrak{C}_x$. Equivalent locally finite sums have the same limits.

We call M a *complete* $\mathfrak{C}$ -module if every locally finite sum in M has a unique limit. Write $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ for the full subcategory of complete modules in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$.

Example 5.5. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring. Consider $\mathfrak{C}$ as a module over itself. Then Proposition 4.23(b) implies that $\mathfrak{C}$ is complete. More generally, $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$

is a complete $\mathfrak{C}$ -module for all $n \geq 0$. However, if W is an infinite-dimensional vector space then $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W$ is in general *not* a complete $\mathfrak{C}$ -module. The problem is with the notion of tensor product: by definition, elements of $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W$ are *finite* sums $\sum_{a=1}^n c_a \otimes w_a$, whereas we want to consider infinite, but locally finite, sums $\sum_{a \in A} c_a \otimes w_a$. So, to obtain a complete module we need to pass to some kind of *completed tensor product* $\mathfrak{C} \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{R}} W$, using the topology on $\mathfrak{C}$ in Definition 4.22.

When $\mathfrak{C} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $n > 0$ and W is an infinite-dimensional vector space, consider the following three sets of maps $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow W$:

- (i) $M_1 = \{\text{smooth maps } w : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow W \text{ with } w(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ contained in a finite-dimensional vector subspace } W' \text{ of } W\};$
- (ii) $M_2 = \{\text{smooth } w : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow W \text{ such that } \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is covered by open } U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } w(U) \text{ contained in a finite-dimensional subspace } W' \text{ of } W\};$ and
- (iii) $M_3 = \{\text{all smooth maps } w : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow W\}.$

Then M_1, M_2, M_3 are $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -modules with $M_1 \subset M_2 \subset M_3$, where M_1 is the tensor product $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W$, and M_2 is the correct completed tensor product $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{R}} W$, a complete $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -module. For our purposes M_3 is too big. To see this, note when we pass to germs at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$M_1 \otimes_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} C_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong M_2 \otimes_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} C_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong C_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W,$$

but $M_3 \otimes_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} C_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is much larger than $C_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W$.

As for $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}$ in Definition 2.16, one can show:

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring. Then there is a reflection functor $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}} : \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$, left adjoint to the inclusion $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$.*

This can be proved by defining $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M)$ to be the set of equivalence classes $[\sum_{a \in A} m_a]$ of locally finite sums $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$, with $\mathfrak{C}$ -action $\mu(c, [\sum_{a \in A} m_a]) = [\sum_{a \in A} \mu(c, m_a)]$ for $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, and checking $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M)$ has the required properties. Alternatively, we can define $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}$ to be the functor $\Gamma \circ \text{MSpec}$ in §6 below, and verify it is a reflection. The correct notion of *completed tensor product* $\mathfrak{C} \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{R}} W$ in Example 5.5, up to isomorphism, is $\mathfrak{C} \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{R}} W = R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} W)$.

To test whether a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module M is complete, it is enough to consider only locally finite sums of the form $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m_b$ where $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ is a partition of unity in $\mathfrak{C}$ and $m_b \in M$. The proof requires $\mathfrak{C}$ to be fair.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring, and M a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module. Then every locally finite sum $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ is equivalent to one of the form $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m'_b$, where $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ is a partition of unity in $\mathfrak{C}$ and $m'_b \in M$ for all $b \in B$. Conversely, all such $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m'_b$ are locally finite sums.*

Proof. Let $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ be a locally finite sum. Then X has an open cover of U such that $m_a|_U \equiv 0$ for all but finitely many $a \in A$. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ is fair X is paracompact, so we can choose a locally finite refinement $\{V_b : b \in B\}$ of this open cover, and Proposition 4.23(c) gives a partition of unity $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ in

$\mathfrak{C}$ subordinate to $\{V_b : b \in B\}$. For each $b \in B$, define $m'_b = \sum_{a \in A_b} m_a$ where $A_b \subseteq A$ is the finite set of $a \in A$ with $m_a|_{V_b} \neq 0$. It is then easy to see that $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m'_b$ is a locally finite sum equivalent to $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$. The last part is immediate as $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ is locally finite. $\square$

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring. Then $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ is closed under kernels, cokernels and extensions in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$, that is, $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ is an abelian subcategory of $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$.*

Proof. Let $0 \rightarrow M_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} M_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} M_3 \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$. First suppose $M_2, M_3 \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$, and $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ is a locally finite sum in M_1 . Then $\sum_{a \in A} \alpha(m_a)$ is locally finite in M_2 which is complete, so $m' = \sum_{a \in A} \alpha(m_a)'$ for some unique $m' \in M_2$. As morphisms of modules preserve limits we have

$$\beta(m') = \sum_{a \in A} \beta \circ \alpha(m_a)' = \sum_{a \in A} 0 = 0,$$

so $\beta(m') = 0$ as limits in M_3 are unique as M_3 is complete. Hence $m' = \alpha(m)$ for some unique $m \in M_1$ by exactness. This m is the unique limit of $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$, so M_1 is complete, and $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ is closed under kernels.

Now suppose $M_1, M_2 \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$. Let $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ be a locally finite sum in M_3 . By Lemma 5.7 we can choose an equivalent sum $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m'_b$ with $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ a partition of unity. By exactness $m'_b = \beta(m_b)$ for some $m_b \in M_2$, all $b \in B$. Then $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m_b$ is a locally finite sum in M_2 , so $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m_b = m$ for some unique $m \in M_2$. As morphisms preserve limits we have $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m'_b = \beta(m) = \sum_{a \in A} m_a$, so limits always exist in M_3 .

To show limits are unique in M_3 , it is enough to consider the zero sequence $\sum 0$. Suppose $m'' \in M_3$ is a limit of $\sum 0$. Then $m'' = \beta(m')$ for some $m' \in M_2$, and X has an open cover of U such that $m''|_U \equiv 0$. Choose a locally finite refinement $\{V_b : b \in B\}$ and a subordinate partition of unity $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$; we can also arrange that $\eta_b = \zeta_b^2$ for $\zeta_b \in \mathfrak{C}$ supported on V_b . Then $\zeta_b \cdot m'' = 0$ in M_3 , so $\beta(\zeta_b \cdot m') = 0$, and thus $\zeta_b \cdot m' = \alpha(m_b)$ for $m_b \in M_1$. Hence $\sum_{b \in B} \zeta_b m_b$ is a locally finite sum in M_1 , so $\sum_{b \in B} \zeta_b m_b = m$ for some unique $m \in M_1$ as M_1 is complete. Therefore

$$\alpha(m) = \sum_{b \in B} \zeta_b \alpha(m_b) = \sum_{b \in B} \zeta_b^2 \cdot m' = \sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot m' = m',$$

and $\alpha(m) = m'$ by uniqueness of limits in M_2 , so $m'' = \beta \circ \alpha(m) = 0$. Thus limits in M_3 are unique, M_3 is complete, and $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ is closed under cokernels. Closedness under extensions follows by a similar argument. $\square$

As $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}$ is a reflection, it is an exact functor between abelian categories. Since every finitely presented $\mathfrak{C}$ -module is the cokernel of a morphism between $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m, \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$, which are complete as in Example 5.5, we have:

Corollary 5.9. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring. Then every finitely presented $\mathfrak{C}$ -module is complete, that is, $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{fp}} \subset \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$.*

5.3 Cotangent modules of C^∞ -rings

Given a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$, we will define the *cotangent module* $(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{C}})$ of $\mathfrak{C}$. Although our definition of $\mathfrak{C}$ -module only used the commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra underlying the C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$, our definition of the particular $\mathfrak{C}$ -module $(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{C}})$ does use the C^∞ -ring structure in a nontrivial way. It is a C^∞ -ring version of the *module of relative differential forms* or *Kähler differentials* in Hartshorne [17, p. 172].

Definition 5.10. Suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is a C^∞ -ring, and (M, μ) a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module. A C^∞ -derivation is an $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map $d : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow M$ such that whenever $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth map and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathfrak{C}$, we have

$$d\Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu\left(\Phi_{\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}}(c_1, \dots, c_n), dc_i\right). \quad (16)$$

Note that d is *not* a morphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules. We call such a pair $(M, \mu), d$ a *cotangent module* for $\mathfrak{C}$ if it has the universal property that for any $\mathfrak{C}$ -module (M', μ') and C^∞ -derivation $d' : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow M'$, there exists a unique morphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules $\phi : (M, \mu) \rightarrow (M', \mu')$ with $d' = \phi \circ d$.

There is a natural construction for a cotangent module: we take (M, μ) to be the quotient of the free $\mathfrak{C}$ -module with basis of symbols dc for $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ by the $\mathfrak{C}$ -submodule spanned by all expressions of the form $d\Phi_f(c_1, \dots, c_n) - \sum_{i=1}^n \mu\left(\Phi_{\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}}(c_1, \dots, c_n), dc_i\right)$ for $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathfrak{C}$. Thus cotangent modules exist, and are unique up to unique isomorphism. When we speak of ‘the’ cotangent module, we mean that constructed above. We may write $(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{C}})$, $d_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ for the (or a choice of) cotangent module for $\mathfrak{C}$.

Let $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}$ be C^∞ -rings with cotangent modules $(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{C}}), d_{\mathfrak{C}}$, $(\Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{D}}), d_{\mathfrak{D}}$, and $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ be a morphism of C^∞ -rings. Then the action $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}} \circ (\phi \times \text{id}_{\Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}})$ makes $\Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}$ into a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module, and $d_{\mathfrak{D}} \circ \phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}$ is a C^∞ -derivation. Thus by the universal property of $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$, there exists a unique morphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules $\Omega_\phi : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}$ with $d_{\mathfrak{D}} \circ \phi = \Omega_\phi \circ d_{\mathfrak{C}}$. This then induces a morphism of $\mathfrak{D}$ -modules $(\Omega_\phi)_* : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}$ with $(\Omega_\phi)_* \circ (d_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathfrak{D}}) = d_{\mathfrak{D}}$ as a composition $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}$. If $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$, $\psi : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ are morphisms of C^∞ -rings then $\Omega_{\psi \circ \phi} = \Omega_\psi \circ \Omega_\phi : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{E}}$.

Example 5.11. Let X be a manifold. Then the cotangent bundle T^*X is a vector bundle over X , so as in Example 5.2 it yields a $C^\infty(X)$ -module $C^\infty(T^*X)$. The exterior derivative $d : C^\infty(X) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*X)$, $d : c \mapsto dc$ is then a C^∞ -derivation, since equation (16) follows from

$$d(f(c_1, \dots, c_n)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(c_1, \dots, c_n) dc_i$$

for $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in C^\infty(X)$, which holds by the chain rule. It is easy to show that $(C^\infty(T^*X), \mu_{T^*X}), d$ have the universal property in Definition 5.10, and so form a *cotangent module* for $C^\infty(X)$.

Now let X, Y be manifolds, and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ a (weakly) smooth map. Then $f^*(TY), TX$ are vector bundles over X , and the derivative of f is a vector bundle morphism $df : TX \rightarrow f^*(TY)$. The dual of this morphism is $(df)^* :$

$f^*(T^*Y) \rightarrow T^*X$. This induces a morphism of $C^\infty(X)$ -modules $((df)^*)_* : C^\infty(f^*(T^*Y)) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*X)$. This $((df)^*)_*$ is identified with $(\Omega_{f^*})_*$ under the natural isomorphism $C^\infty(f^*(T^*Y)) \cong C^\infty(T^*Y) \otimes_{C^\infty(Y)} C^\infty(X)$, where we identify $C^\infty(Y), C^\infty(X), f^*$ with $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \phi$ in Definition 5.10.

The importance of Definition 5.10 is that it abstracts the notion of cotangent bundle of a manifold in a way that makes sense for any C^∞ -ring.

Remark 5.12. (a) There is a second way to define a cotangent-type module for a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$, namely the module $\text{Kd}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ of *Kähler differentials* of the underlying $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra of $\mathfrak{C}$. This is defined as for $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$, but requiring (16) to hold only when $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a polynomial. Since we impose many fewer relations, $\text{Kd}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is generally much larger than $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$, so that $\text{Kd}_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is not a finitely generated $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -module for $n > 0$, for instance.

(b) Cotangent modules should be part of a more complicated story about *cotangent complexes*. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a morphism of rings then the *cotangent complex* L_f , constructed by Illusie [19], is an object in the derived category of B -modules $D^b(B\text{-mod})$. As discussed by Spivak [39, §7], presumably the same construction works for C^∞ -rings, so that if $\phi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings then one should obtain a C^∞ -cotangent complex $L_\phi^{C^\infty}$. One can also form the cotangent complex L_ϕ of ϕ regarded just as a ring morphism. Then L_ϕ and $L_\phi^{C^\infty}$ both lie in $D^b(\mathfrak{D}\text{-mod})$, but will in general be different, since L_ϕ ignores the C^∞ -ring structures of $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}$ but $L_\phi^{C^\infty}$ does not.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a C^∞ -ring then there is a unique C^∞ -ring morphism $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$, since $\mathbb{R}$ is an initial object in **C^∞ Rings**. Thus we can form cotangent complexes $L_\pi^{C^\infty}$ and L_π in $D^b(\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod})$. We expect that our cotangent module $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is canonically isomorphic to $H^0(L_\pi^{C^\infty})$, whereas the module of Kähler differentials $\text{Kd}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ in (a) is canonically isomorphic to $H^0(L_\pi)$.

Theorem 5.13. *If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a finitely generated C^∞ -ring then $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is a finitely generated $\mathfrak{C}$ -module. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a fair C^∞ -ring then $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is complete. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a finitely presented, or good, C^∞ -ring, then $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is finitely presented.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely generated we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$. Write $x_1, \dots, x_n$ for the generators of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then any $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ may be written as $\phi(f)$ for some $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and (16) implies that

$$dc = d\Phi_f(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(\Phi_{\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}}(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)), d \circ \phi(x_i)).$$

Hence the generators dc of $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ for $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ are $\mathfrak{C}$ -linear combinations of $d \circ \phi(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, so $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is generated by the $d \circ \phi(x_i)$, and is finitely generated.

Now suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is fair. From the first part we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow 0$, where $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ is the free $\mathfrak{C}$ -module with basis $e_1, \dots, e_n$, and $\alpha(e_i) = d \circ \phi(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and M is the $\mathfrak{C}$ -submodule of $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ generated by elements

$$\phi\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}\right) \cdot e_1 + \dots + \phi\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}\right) \cdot e_n \quad \text{for } f \in I. \quad (17)$$

By Example 5.5 $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ is complete. We will show M is complete. Then $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is complete, as $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ is closed under cokernels by Proposition 5.8. Since locally finite sums have unique limits in $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \supset M$, it is enough to show that M is closed under locally finite sums.

Let $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ be a locally finite sum in M . Then by Lemma 5.7 and (17), $\sum_{a \in A} m_a$ is equivalent to a locally finite sum of the form

$$\sum_{b \in B} \phi(\eta_b) \cdot \left[\sum_{c \in C_b} \phi(g_{bc}) \cdot \left(\phi\left(\frac{\partial f_{bc}}{\partial x_1}\right) \cdot e_1 + \cdots + \phi\left(\frac{\partial f_{bc}}{\partial x_n}\right) \cdot e_n \right) \right],$$

where $\{\phi(\eta_b) : b \in B\}$ is a partition of unity in $\mathfrak{C}$ which lifts to a locally finite sum $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and C_b is a finite indexing set for each $b \in B$, and $f_{bc} \in I$, $g_{bc} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $b \in B$ and $c \in C_b$.

Consider the sum $\sum_{b \in B} \sum_{c \in C_b} \eta_b g_{bc} f_{bc}$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This is a locally finite sum, as $\sum_{b \in B} \eta_b$ is locally finite and each C_b is finite, so it has a unique limit f . As $f_{bc} \in I$ for all b, c we have $\eta_b g_{bc} f_{bc} \in I$, so $f \in I$ as I is closed under locally finite sums by Proposition 4.23(a). But

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{b \in B} \phi(\eta_b) \cdot \left[\sum_{c \in C_b} \phi(g_{bc}) \cdot \left(\phi\left(\frac{\partial f_{bc}}{\partial x_1}\right) \cdot e_1 + \cdots + \phi\left(\frac{\partial f_{bc}}{\partial x_n}\right) \cdot e_n \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{b \in B} \sum_{c \in C_b} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi\left(\frac{\partial(\eta_b g_{bc} f_{bc})}{\partial x_i}\right) \cdot e_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}\right) \cdot e_i \in M, \end{aligned}$$

by (17), where in the first step we use

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\eta_b) \phi(g_{bc}) \phi\left(\frac{\partial f_{bc}}{\partial x_1}\right) &= \phi\left(\eta_b g_{bc} \frac{\partial f_{bc}}{\partial x_1}\right) = \phi\left(\frac{\partial(\eta_b g_{bc} f_{bc})}{\partial x_1}\right) - \phi\left(f_{bc} \cdot \frac{\partial(\eta_b g_{bc})}{\partial x_1}\right) \\ &= \phi\left(\frac{\partial(\eta_b g_{bc} f_{bc})}{\partial x_i}\right) - \phi\left(f_{bc} \phi\left(\frac{\partial(\eta_b g_{bc})}{\partial x_i}\right)\right) = \phi\left(\frac{\partial(\eta_b g_{bc} f_{bc})}{\partial x_i}\right), \end{aligned}$$

since ϕ is an algebra morphism and $f_{bc} \in I$ so that $\phi(f_{bc}) = 0$. Thus M is closed under finite sums, so $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is complete, proving the second part.

For the third part, it is enough to suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is good. Then we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \hookrightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$, where ϕ is a morphism of C^∞ -rings and the ideal $I = (f_1, \dots, f_m, \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty)$ for some closed $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. We will define an exact sequence of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules

$$(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m, \mu_{\mathbb{R}^m}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} (\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n, \mu_{\mathbb{R}^n}) \xrightarrow{\beta} (\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{C}}) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (18)$$

Write $(a_1, \dots, a_m), (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ for bases of $\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n$. As $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m, \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ are free $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules, the $\mathfrak{C}$ -module morphisms α, β are specified uniquely by giving $\alpha(a_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $\beta(b_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, which we define to be

$$\alpha : a_i \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\Phi_{\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}}(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)), b_j \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta : b_j \mapsto d_{\mathfrak{C}}(\phi(x_j)).$$

Then for $i = 1, \dots, m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \circ \alpha(a_i) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{\mathfrak{C}} \left(\Phi_{\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}}(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)), d_{\mathfrak{C}}(\phi(x_j)) \right) \\ &= d_{\mathfrak{C}} \left(\Phi_{f_i}(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)) \right) \\ &= d_{\mathfrak{C}} \circ \phi \left(\Phi_{f_i}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right) = d_{\mathfrak{C}} \circ \phi(f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = d_{\mathfrak{C}}(0) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

using (16) in the second step as $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is a C^∞ -derivation, ϕ a morphism of C^∞ -rings in the third, the definition of $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as a C^∞ -ring in the fourth, and $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in I = \text{Ker } \phi$ in the fifth. Hence $\beta \circ \alpha = 0$, and (18) is a complex.

Thus β induces $\beta_* : (\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n) / \alpha(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$. We will show β_* is an isomorphism, so that (18) is exact. Define $d : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n) / \alpha(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m)$ by

$$d(\phi(h)) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(\Phi_{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x_j}}(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)), b_j \right) + \alpha(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m). \quad (19)$$

Here every $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ may be written as $\phi(h)$ for some smooth $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as ϕ is surjective. To show (19) is well-defined we must show the right hand side is independent of the choice of h with $\phi(h) = c$, that is, we must show that the r.h.s. is zero if $h \in I$. It is enough to check this for h in a set of generators for I . If $h = f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ the r.h.s. of (19) is zero by definition of α . If $h \in \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty$ then $\frac{\partial h}{\partial x_j}$ also lies in $\mathfrak{m}_X^\infty \subset I$ and

$$\Phi_{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x_j}}(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_n)) = \phi \circ \Phi_{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x_j}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \phi\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial x_j}\right) = 0,$$

so the r.h.s. of (19) is zero. Hence d in (19) is well-defined.

It is easy to see that d is a C^∞ -derivation, and that $\beta_* \circ d = d_{\mathfrak{C}}$. So by the universal property of $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$, there is a unique $\mathfrak{C}$ -module morphism $\psi : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n) / \alpha(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $d = \psi \circ d_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Thus $\beta_* \circ \psi \circ d_{\mathfrak{C}} = \beta_* \circ d = d_{\mathfrak{C}} = \text{id}_{\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}} \circ d_{\mathfrak{C}}$, so as $\text{Im } d_{\mathfrak{C}}$ generates $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ as an $\mathfrak{C}$ -module we see that $\beta_* \circ \psi = \text{id}_{\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}}$. Similarly $\psi \circ \beta_*$ is the identity, so ψ, β_* are inverse, and β_* is an isomorphism. Therefore (18) is exact, and $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is finitely presented. $\square$

Cotangent modules behave well under localization.

Proposition 5.14. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a C^∞ -ring and $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, with localization $\Pi^c : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ as in Definition 2.12. Then the morphism of $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ -modules $(\Omega_{\Pi^c})_* : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}] \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]}$ be constructed as in Definition 5.10. Since $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ has an extra generator c^{-1} and an extra relation $c \cdot c^{-1} = 1$, we see that the $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ -module $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]}$ may be constructed from $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$ by adding an extra generator $d(c^{-1})$ and an extra relation $d(c \cdot c^{-1} - 1) = 0$. But using (16) and $c \cdot c^{-1} = 1$ in $\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]$, we can show that this extra relation is equivalent to $d(c^{-1}) = -(c^{-1})^2 d_{\mathfrak{C}} c$. Thus the extra relation exactly cancels the effect of adding the extra generator, so $(\Omega_{\Pi^c})_*$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

We can also understand how cotangent modules behave under the reflection functor $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ of Definition 2.16.

Proposition 5.15. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a finitely generated C^∞ -ring, and $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} = R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C})$ its fair reflection, with surjective projection $\pi : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{C}}$. Then there is a canonical isomorphism of $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}$ -modules $\Omega_{\bar{\mathfrak{C}}} \cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}})$ identifying $(\Omega_{\pi})_* : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\bar{\mathfrak{C}}}$ with the natural surjective morphism $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}})$.*

Proof. We have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$. Let $\bar{I}$ be the closure of I under locally finite sums in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $\bar{I}$ is fair, as in Proposition 4.23(a), and we obtain an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \bar{I} \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \xrightarrow{\bar{\phi}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow 0$. There are exact sequences $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ -mod and $0 \rightarrow \bar{M} \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}} \Omega_{\bar{\mathfrak{C}}} \rightarrow 0$ in $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}$ -mod, where we write $e_1, \dots, e_n$ for the generators of $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n$ for the generators of $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$, and then $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ are defined by $\alpha(e_i) = d\phi(x_i)$ and $\bar{\alpha}(\bar{e}_i) = d\bar{\phi}(x_i)$, and M is the submodule of $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ generated by elements $\sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})e_i$ for $f \in I$, and $\bar{M}$ is the submodule of $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ generated by elements $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\phi}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\bar{e}_i$ for $f \in \bar{I}$.

Thus there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \hat{M} \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}} \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow 0$, where $\hat{M}$ is the submodule of $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ generated by elements $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\phi}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\bar{e}_i$ for $f \in I$. Given a locally finite sum $f = \sum_{a \in A} f_a$ in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $f_a \in I$ and $f \in \bar{I}$, the corresponding sum $\sum_{a \in A} [\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\phi}(\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial x_i})\bar{e}_i]$ in $\hat{M}$ is locally finite, with limit $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\phi}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\bar{e}_i$ in $\bar{M}$. Hence $\bar{M}$ is the closure of $\hat{M}$ under locally finite sums in $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$. Note too that all locally finite sums in $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ have unique limits, as $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}$ is fair. The definition of $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}$ now implies that

$$R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}}) \cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}((\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n)/\hat{M}) = (\bar{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n)/\bar{M} \cong \Omega_{\bar{\mathfrak{C}}},$$

as we want. The identification of $(\Omega_{\pi})_*$ with the natural morphism is clear from the actions of $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ on $e_1, \dots, e_n$ and $\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n$. $\square$

Here is a useful exactness property of cotangent modules.

Theorem 5.16. *Suppose we are given a pushout diagram of finitely generated C^∞ -rings:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{C} & \xrightarrow{\quad \beta \quad} & \mathfrak{E} \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \delta \\ \mathfrak{D} & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathfrak{F}, \end{array} \quad (20)$$

so that $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{D} \amalg_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{E}$. Then the following sequence of $\mathfrak{F}$ -modules is exact:

$$\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mathfrak{C}, \gamma \circ \alpha} \mathfrak{F} \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} (\Omega_{\alpha})_* \oplus \\ -(\Omega_{\beta})_* \end{smallmatrix}} \begin{array}{c} \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}} \otimes_{\mu_{\mathfrak{D}}, \mathfrak{D}, \gamma} \mathfrak{F} \\ \Omega_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes_{\mu_{\mathfrak{E}}, \mathfrak{E}, \delta} \mathfrak{F} \end{array} \oplus \xrightarrow{(\Omega_{\gamma})_* \oplus (\Omega_{\delta})_*} \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (21)$$

Here $(\Omega_{\alpha})_* : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}, \mathfrak{C}, \gamma \circ \alpha} \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}} \otimes_{\mu_{\mathfrak{D}}, \mathfrak{D}, \gamma} \mathfrak{F}$ is induced by $\Omega_{\alpha} : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}}$, and so on. Note the sign of $-(\Omega_{\beta})_*$ in (21).

Proof. By $\Omega_{\psi \circ \phi} = \Omega_{\psi} \circ \Omega_{\phi}$ in Definition 5.10 and commutativity of (20) we have $\Omega_{\gamma} \circ \Omega_{\alpha} = \Omega_{\gamma \circ \alpha} = \Omega_{\delta \circ \beta} = \Omega_{\delta} \circ \Omega_{\beta} : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}}$. Tensoring with $\mathfrak{F}$ then gives $(\Omega_{\gamma})_* \circ (\Omega_{\alpha})_* = (\Omega_{\delta})_* \circ (\Omega_{\beta})_* : \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}}$. As the composition of morphisms in (21) is $(\Omega_{\gamma})_* \circ (\Omega_{\alpha})_* - (\Omega_{\delta})_* \circ (\Omega_{\beta})_*$, this implies (21) is a complex.

For simplicity, first suppose $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F}$ are good. Use the notation of Example 2.27 and the proof of Proposition 2.28, with exact sequences (7) and (8), where $I = (h_1, \dots, h_i, \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty) \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l)$, $J = (d_1, \dots, d_j, \mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty) \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $K =$

$(e_1, \dots, e_k, \mathbf{m}_Z^\infty) \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$, $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ closed. Then L is given by (9). Applying the proof of Theorem 5.13 to (7)–(8) yields exact sequences of $\mathfrak{F}$ -modules

$$\mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^i \xrightarrow{\epsilon_1} \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^l \xrightarrow{\zeta_1} \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{F} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (22)$$

$$\mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^j \xrightarrow{\epsilon_2} \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \xrightarrow{\zeta_2} \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{F} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^k \xrightarrow{\epsilon_3} \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\zeta_3} \Omega_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{E}} \mathfrak{F} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^{j+k+l} \xrightarrow{\epsilon_4} \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^{m+n} = \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \oplus \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \xrightarrow{\zeta_4} \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}} \longrightarrow 0, \quad (25)$$

where for (22)–(24) we have tensored (18) over $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ with $\mathfrak{F}$.

Define $\mathfrak{F}$ -module morphisms $\theta_1 : \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m$, $\theta_2 : \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\theta_1(a_1, \dots, a_l) = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, $\theta_2(a_1, \dots, a_l) = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ with

$$b_q = \sum_{p=1}^l \Phi_{\frac{\partial f_p}{\partial y_q}}(\xi(y_1), \dots, \xi(y_m)) \cdot a_p, \quad c_r = \sum_{p=1}^l \Phi_{\frac{\partial g_p}{\partial y_r}}(\xi(z_1), \dots, \xi(z_n)) \cdot a_p,$$

for $a_p, b_q, c_r \in \mathfrak{F}$. Now consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \begin{matrix} \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^j \oplus \\ \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^k \oplus \\ \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^l \end{matrix} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_2 & 0 & \theta_1 \\ 0 & \epsilon_3 & -\theta_2 \end{pmatrix}} & \begin{matrix} \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \oplus \\ \mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \end{matrix} & \xrightarrow{\zeta_4} & \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}} \longrightarrow 0 \\ \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \zeta_1 \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta_3 \end{pmatrix} & & \parallel \text{id}_{\Omega_{\mathfrak{F}}} \\ \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{F} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} (\Omega_{\alpha})_* \\ -(\Omega_{\beta})_* \end{pmatrix}} & \Omega_{\mathfrak{D}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{F} \oplus \Omega_{\mathfrak{E}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{E}} \mathfrak{F} & \xrightarrow{((\Omega_{\gamma})_* \ (\Omega_{\delta})_*)} & \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (26)$$

using matrix notation. The top line is the exact sequence (25), where the sign in $-\theta_2$ comes from the sign of g_p in the generators $f_p(y_1, \dots, y_m) - g_p(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ of L in (9). The bottom line is the complex (21).

The left hand square commutes as $\zeta_2 \circ \epsilon_2 = \zeta_3 \circ \epsilon_3 = 0$ by exactness of (23)–(24) and $\zeta_2 \circ \theta_1 = (\Omega_{\alpha})_* \circ \zeta_1$ follows from $\alpha \circ \phi(x_p) = \psi(f_p)$, and $\zeta_3 \circ \theta_2 = (\Omega_{\beta})_* \circ \zeta_1$ follows from $\beta \circ \phi(x_p) = \chi(g_p)$. The right hand square commutes as ζ_4 and $(\Omega_{\gamma})_* \circ \zeta_2$ act on $\mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m$ by $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \mapsto \sum_{q=1}^m a_q d_{\mathfrak{F}} \circ \xi(y_q)$, and ζ_4 and $(\Omega_{\delta})_* \circ \zeta_3$ act on $\mathfrak{F} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$ by $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \mapsto \sum_{r=1}^n b_r d_{\mathfrak{F}} \circ \xi(z_r)$. Hence (26) is commutative. The columns are surjective since $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3$ are surjective as (22)–(24) are exact and identities are surjective. So, since (26) is commutative with surjective columns, exact top row, and bottom row a complex, it follows that the bottom row is exact by standard facts about abelian categories. This proves the theorem for $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{F}$ good. For the finitely generated case we can use the same proof, but allowing i, j, k infinite. $\square$

Here is an example of Theorem 5.16 for manifolds.

Example 5.17. Let W, X, Y, Z, e, f, g, h be as in Theorem 3.6, so that (10) is a Cartesian square of manifolds and (11) a pushout square of C^∞ -rings. We have the following sequence of morphisms of vector bundles on W :

$$0 \rightarrow (g \circ e)^*(T^*Z) \xrightarrow{e^*(dg^*) \oplus -f^*(dh^*)} e^*(T^*X) \oplus f^*(T^*Y) \xrightarrow{de^* \oplus df^*} T^*W \rightarrow 0. \quad (27)$$

Here $dg : TX \rightarrow g^*(TZ)$ is a morphism of vector bundles over X , and $dg^* : g^*(T^*Z) \rightarrow T^*X$ is the dual morphism, and $e^*(dg^*) : (g \circ e)^*(T^*Z) \rightarrow e^*(T^*X)$ is the pullback of this dual morphism to W . In §6 and §9 we will distinguish between $(g \circ e)^*(T^*Z)$ and $e^*(g^*(T^*Z))$, but here we identify them for simplicity.

Since $g \circ e = h \circ f$, we have $de^* \circ e^*(dg^*) = df^* \circ f^*(dh^*)$, and so (27) is a complex. As g, h are transverse and (10) is Cartesian, (27) is exact. So passing to smooth sections in (27) we get an exact sequence of $C^\infty(W)$ -modules:

$$0 \rightarrow C^\infty((g \circ e)^*(T^*Z)) \xrightarrow{(e^*(dg^*) \oplus -f^*(dh^*))^*} C^\infty(e^*(T^*X) \oplus f^*(T^*Y)) \xrightarrow{(de^* \oplus df^*)^*} C^\infty(T^*W) \rightarrow 0.$$

The final four terms are the exact sequence (21) for the pushout diagram (11).

6 Sheaves of modules on C^∞ -schemes

We now develop analogues for C^∞ -schemes of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules, quasicoherent sheaves, and coherent sheaves on a scheme X , following Hartshorne [17, §II.5] or Grothendieck [16, §0.3–§0.5] in conventional algebraic geometry, and we define cotangent sheaves of C^∞ -schemes, based on sheaves of relative differentials in Hartshorne [17, §II.8]. Some issues arise as our C^∞ -rings are generally not noetherian as $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras, but in algebraic geometry one usually only considers coherent sheaves on noetherian schemes. The author knows of no previous work on all this in the C^∞ -scheme context, so this section may be new.

6.1 Sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on a C^∞ -ringed space $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$

We define sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on a C^∞ -ringed space, following [17, §II.5].

Definition 6.1. Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a C^∞ -ringed space. A *sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules*, or simply an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -*module*, $\mathcal{E}$ on X assigns a module $\mathcal{E}(U) = (M_U, \mu_U)$ over the C^∞ -ring $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ for each open set $U \subseteq X$, and a linear map $\mathcal{E}_{UV} : M_U \rightarrow M_V$ for each inclusion of open sets $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$, such that the following commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \times M_U & \xrightarrow{\mu_U} & M_U \\ \downarrow \rho_{UV} \times \mathcal{E}_{UV} & & \mathcal{E}_{UV} \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(V) \times M_V & \xrightarrow{\mu_V} & M_V, \end{array} \quad (28)$$

and all this data $\mathcal{E}(U), \mathcal{E}_{UV}$ satisfies the usual sheaf axioms [17, §II.1].

A *morphism of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules* $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ assigns a morphism of $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -modules $\phi(U) : \mathcal{E}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(U)$ for each open set $U \subseteq X$, such that

$\phi(V) \circ \mathcal{E}_{UV} = \mathcal{F}_{UV} \circ \phi(U)$ for each inclusion of open sets $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$. Then $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules form an *abelian category*, which we write as $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$.

Remark 6.2. Recall that a C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$ has an underlying commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra, and a module over $\mathfrak{C}$ is a module over this $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra, by Definitions 2.7 and 5.1. Thus, by truncating the C^∞ -rings $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ to commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras, regarded as rings, a C^∞ -ringed space $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ has an underlying ringed space in the usual sense of algebraic geometry [17, p. 72], [16, §0.4]. Our definition of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules are simply $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on this underlying ringed space [17, §II.5], [16, §0.4.1]. Thus we can apply results from algebraic geometry without change, for instance that $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ is an abelian category, as in [17, p. 202].

Definition 6.3. Let $\underline{f} = (f, f^\sharp) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ be a morphism of C^∞ -ringed spaces, and $\mathcal{E}$ be a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules on $(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$. Following Grothendieck [16, §4.3.1] or Hartshorne [17, p. 65, p. 110], define the *pullback* $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E})$ to be the sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ associated to the presheaf $\underline{U} \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \mathcal{E}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, where U is an open set in X , and the limit is over open sets V in Y containing $f(U)$, and $\mathcal{E}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is computed using the morphism $\rho_{f^{-1}(V)U} \circ f^\sharp(V) : \mathcal{O}_Y(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)$.

If $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a morphism of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules we have an induced morphism of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules $\underline{f}^*(\phi) : \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{F})$. Then $\underline{f}^* : \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ is a *functor* from $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules on Y to $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on X .

Remark 6.4. Here is a slightly subtle point. Pullbacks $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E})$ are a kind of fibre product, and may be characterized by a universal property. So they should be regarded as being *unique up to canonical isomorphism*, rather than unique. One can give an explicit construction for pullbacks, or use the Axiom of Choice to choose $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\underline{f}, \mathcal{E}$, and so speak of ‘the’ pullback $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E})$. However, it may not be possible to make these choices strictly functorial in $\underline{f}$.

That is, if $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$, $\underline{g} : \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ are morphisms and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Z\text{-mod}$ then $(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(\mathcal{E})$, $\underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(\mathcal{E}))$ are canonically isomorphic in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, but may not be equal. We will write $I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(\mathcal{E}) : (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(\mathcal{E}))$ for these canonical isomorphisms. Then $I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}} : (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^* \Rightarrow \underline{f}^* \circ \underline{g}^*$ is a *natural isomorphism* of functors. It is common to ignore this point and identify $(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*$ with $\underline{f}^* \circ \underline{g}^*$, but this would cause problems in [22]. Vistoli [40] makes careful use of natural isomorphisms $(g \circ f)^* \Rightarrow f^* \circ g^*$ in his treatment of descent theory.

When $\underline{f}$ is the identity $\text{id}_{\underline{X}} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ we do not require $\text{id}_{\underline{X}}^*(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}$, but as $\mathcal{E}$ is a possible pullback for $\text{id}_{\underline{X}}^*(\mathcal{E})$ there is a canonical isomorphism $\delta_{\underline{X}}(\mathcal{E}) : \text{id}_{\underline{X}}^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, and then $\delta_{\underline{X}} : \text{id}_{\underline{X}}^* \Rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}}$ is a natural isomorphism of functors.

By Grothendieck [16, §0.4.3.1] we have:

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ be C^∞ -ringed spaces and $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ a morphism. Then pullback $\underline{f}^* : \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ is a **right exact functor**. That is, if*

$\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$ then $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{\underline{f}^*(\phi)} \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\underline{f}^*(\psi)} \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$.

In general $\underline{f}^*$ is not exact, or left exact, unless $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is *flat*.

6.2 Sheaves on affine C^∞ -schemes, and MSpec

In §4.2 we defined $\text{Spec} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{LC}^\infty\mathbf{RS}$. In a similar way, if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a C^∞ -ring and $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ we can define $\text{MSpec} : \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$.

Definition 6.6. Let $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for some C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$, let (M, μ) be a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module, and $U \subseteq X$ be open. Then M is a representation of $\mathfrak{C}$, regarded as a commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra. We have morphisms of C^∞ -rings $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}) = \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ and $\rho_{XU} : \mathcal{O}_X(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, so that $\rho_{XU} \circ \Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is a morphism of commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras. Thus we may form the tensor product $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ over $\mathfrak{C}$, which is an $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -module. If $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$ are open then the algebra morphism $\rho_{UV} : \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(V)$ induces a morphism $\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV} : M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(V)$. The assignment $U \mapsto M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ and $(U, V) \mapsto \text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV}$ defines a *presheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules* on $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$.

Define $\text{MSpec}(M, \mu)$ to be the sheafification of this presheaf. If $\alpha : (M, \mu) \rightarrow (M', \mu')$ is a morphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules, it induces a morphism of the associated presheaves, and we define $\text{MSpec } \alpha : \text{MSpec}(M, \mu) \rightarrow \text{MSpec}(M', \mu')$ to be the induced morphism of sheaves. Then $\text{MSpec} : \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ is a *functor*, the analogue for modules of the functor Spec in §4.2. Since sheafification is an exact functor, MSpec is also an *exact functor*.

When $M = \mathfrak{C}$ the presheaf $U \mapsto \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is already a sheaf, and $\text{MSpec } \mathfrak{C} \cong \mathcal{O}_X$, regarded as a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules.

Now suppose $\mathfrak{C}$ is a *fair* C^∞ -ring. Then $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(X)$ is an isomorphism by Proposition 4.8. Define the *global sections functor* $\Gamma : \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ on objects by $\Gamma : \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathcal{E}(X)$, where the $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$ -module $\mathcal{E}(X)$ is regarded as a $\mathfrak{C}$ -module using $\Phi_{\mathfrak{C}}^{-1}$, and on morphisms $\alpha : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ by $\Gamma : \alpha \mapsto \alpha(X)$. Then Γ is a right adjoint to MSpec , that is, as in (12) for all $M \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ there are functorial isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}}(M, \Gamma(\mathcal{E})) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}}(\text{MSpec } M, \mathcal{E}). \quad (29)$$

Taking $\mathcal{E} = \text{MSpec } M$, we obtain a natural morphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules $\Phi_M : M \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{MSpec } M)$ corresponding to $\text{id}_{\text{MSpec } M}$ in (29).

Proposition 4.8 showed that $\Gamma \circ \text{Spec} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ and $R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fg}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Rings}^{\text{fa}}$ are naturally isomorphic functors. In the same way, for $\mathfrak{C}$ a fair C^∞ -ring the functors $\Gamma \circ \text{MSpec} : \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ and $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}} : \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}}$ are naturally isomorphic. Furthermore, $\text{MSpec} \circ \Gamma : \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ is naturally isomorphic to the identity. In contrast, in conventional algebraic geometry, both $\Gamma \circ \text{MSpec}$ and $\text{MSpec} \circ \Gamma$ are naturally isomorphic to the identity, as in Hartshorne [17, Cor. II.5.5].

Parts (d),(e) below describe the effect of the sheafification used to define $\text{MSpec } M$ in Definition 6.6. In particular, when M is finitely presented (e) shows that the presheaf $U \mapsto M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ in Definition 6.6 is already a sheaf.

Theorem 6.7. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair C^∞ -ring, and $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$. Then*

- (a) *There are natural isomorphisms $\Gamma(\text{MSpec } M) \cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M)$ for all M in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ which identify $\Phi_M : M \rightarrow \Gamma(\text{MSpec } M)$ with the natural projection $\pi : M \rightarrow R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M)$. If M is complete then Φ_M is an isomorphism.*

- (b) If $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ then $\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ is a complete $\mathfrak{C}$ -module, and there is a natural isomorphism $\mathcal{E} \cong \text{MSpec} \circ \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$.
- (c) MSpec and Γ induce an equivalence of categories $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{co}} \sim \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$.
- (d) Let $M \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$ and $U \subseteq X$ be open. Then there is a natural isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -modules $(\text{MSpec } M)(U) \cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$.
- (e) Let $M \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{fp}}$ and $U \subseteq X$ be open. Then there is a natural isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -modules $(\text{MSpec } M)(U) \cong M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$.

Parts (d),(e) also hold if $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely generated rather than fair.

Proof. We will first show that the presheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules $U \mapsto R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ on X is actually a sheaf. For the first sheaf axiom, suppose $U \subseteq X$ is open and $\{V_a : a \in A\}$ is an open cover of U , and $s \in R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ satisfies $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_a})s = 0$ in $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(V_a))$ for all $a \in A$. We must show $s = 0$. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ and hence $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ are fair, as in §4.3 we can choose a locally finite refinement $\{W_b : b \in B\}$ of $\{V_a : a \in A\}$, and a partition of unity $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ subordinate to $\{W_b : b \in B\}$.

Let $b \in B$. Then there exists $a \in A$ with $W_b \subseteq V_a$, as $\{W_b : b \in B\}$ is a refinement of $\{V_a : a \in A\}$. Since η_b is supported on $W_b \subset V_a$, one can show using a partition of unity argument that

$$\rho_{UV_a} : \{\eta_b \cdot f : f \in \mathcal{O}_X(U)\} \longrightarrow \{\rho_{UV_a}(\eta_b) \cdot f' : f' \in \mathcal{O}_X(V_a)\}$$

is an isomorphism. Thus tensoring over $\mathfrak{C}$ with M shows that

$$\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_a} : \{\eta_b \cdot m : m \in M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)\} \rightarrow \{\rho_{UV_a}(\eta_b) \cdot m' : m' \in M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(V_a)\}$$

is an isomorphism. Therefore applying $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_a}) : \{\eta_b \cdot m : m \in R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))\} \\ \longrightarrow \{\rho_{UV_a}(\eta_b) \cdot m' : m' \in R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(V_a))\} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

is an isomorphism. Since

$$R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_a})(\eta_b \cdot s) = \rho_{UV_a}(\eta_b) \cdot R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_a})(s) = 0,$$

this shows that $\eta_b \cdot s = 0$ in $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ for all $b \in B$. But $s = \sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot s$ as $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ is complete and $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ is a partition of unity, so $s = 0$, as we have to prove.

For the second sheaf axiom, let $U \subseteq X$ be open, $\{V_a : a \in A\}$ an open cover of U , and $s_a \in R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(V_a))$ for $a \in A$ be given such that $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{V_a \cap V_{a'}})s_a = R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{V_{a'} \cap V_a})s_{a'}$ in $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(V_a \cap V_{a'}))$ for all $a, a' \in A$. Choose $\{W_b : b \in B\}$, $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ as above, and for each $b \in B$ choose $a_b \in A$ with $W_b \subseteq V_{a_b}$. The argument above with (30) an isomorphism shows that there exists $t_b \in R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ with

$$R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_{a_b}})(\eta_b \cdot t_b) = \rho_{UV_{a_b}}(\eta_b) \cdot s_{a_b},$$

and moreover $\eta_b \cdot t_b$ is unique. Now define $s = \sum_{b \in B} \eta_b \cdot t_b$ in $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$. This is a locally finite sum, as $\{\eta_b : b \in B\}$ is a partition of unity, so s is well-defined as $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ is complete. A similar argument to the first part shows that $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\text{id}_M \otimes \rho_{UV_a})s = s_a$ for $a \in A$, proving the second sheaf axiom.

The stalk of the sheaf $U \mapsto R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ at $x \in X$ is $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_{X,x})$, where $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is the stalk of $\mathcal{O}_X$ at x . But $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_{X,x}) = M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$, since modules over C^∞ -local rings are trivially complete. But the stalk of the presheaf $U \mapsto M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ at x is $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$. Hence the sheaf $U \mapsto R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$ and the presheaf $U \mapsto M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ have the same stalks, so the sheaf is canonically isomorphic to the sheafification of the presheaf. This proves (d), and taking $U = X$ proves (a).

For (e), if $M \in \mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\text{fp}}$ there is an exact sequence $\mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$. Since $- \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is right exact $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_X(U)\text{-mod}$, so $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is a finitely presented $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -module. Hence $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is complete by Corollary 5.9, and $R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)) \cong M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$. Thus (e) follows from (d). If $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely generated rather than fair then $\bar{\mathfrak{C}} = R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C})$ is fair and the isomorphism $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \cong \text{Spec } \bar{\mathfrak{C}}$ identifies $\text{MSpec } M$ with $\text{MSpec}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}})$, so (d),(e) for $\mathfrak{C}$ follow from (d),(e) for $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}$ as $(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \bar{\mathfrak{C}}) \otimes_{\bar{\mathfrak{C}}} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong M \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$.

For (b), if $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ then from the sheaf conditions on (e) it is obvious that every locally finite sum in $\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ has a unique limit, so $\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ is complete. Taking $M = \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ in (29) gives a natural morphism $\Phi_{\mathcal{E}} : \text{MSpec} \circ \Gamma(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ corresponding to $\text{id}_{\Gamma(\mathcal{E})}$. Let $x \in X$, and suppose U is an open neighbourhood of x in X and $e \in \mathcal{E}(U)$. By facts about smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ there exists an open neighbourhood V of x in U and $\eta \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that η is supported on U , that is, $\pi_x(\eta) = 0$ in $\mathfrak{C}_y$ for all $y \in X \setminus U$, and $\eta \equiv 1$ in V . Then $\rho_{XU}(\eta) \cdot e \in \mathcal{E}(U)$ can be extended by zero on $X \setminus U$ to a unique $f \in \mathcal{E}(X) = \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\rho_{XU}(f) = \rho_{XU}(\eta) \cdot e$. Thus $\rho_{XV}(f) = \rho_{XV}(\eta) \cdot \rho_{UV}(e) = \rho_{UV}(e)$ as $\rho_{XV}(\eta) = 1$. Hence, given any $x \in U \subset X$ and $e \in \mathcal{E}(U)$ we can find $f \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ and open V with $x \in V \subseteq U$ such that $\rho_{XV}(f) = \rho_{UV}(e)$. Therefore the natural projection $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_x$ from $\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ to germs of sections of $\mathcal{E}$ at x is surjective. Hence $\Phi_{\mathcal{E}}|_x : \text{MSpec} \circ \Gamma(\mathcal{E})|_x \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_x$ is surjective. It easily follows that $\Phi_{\mathcal{E}}|_x$ is an isomorphism, and as this holds for all $x \in X$, $\Phi_{\mathcal{E}}$ is an isomorphism. This proves (b), and (c) follows from (a) and (b). $\square$

We can understand pullback $\underline{f}^*$ explicitly in terms of modules over the corresponding C^∞ -rings.

Proposition 6.8. *Let $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}$ be C^∞ -rings, $\phi : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ a morphism, M, N be $\mathfrak{D}$ -modules, and $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$ a morphism of $\mathfrak{D}$ -modules. Write $\underline{X} = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$, $\underline{Y} = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{D}$, $\underline{f} = \text{Spec}(\phi) : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$, and $\mathcal{E} = \text{MSpec}(M)$, $\mathcal{F} = \text{MSpec}(N)$ in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$. Then there are natural isomorphisms $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}) \cong \text{MSpec}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C})$ and $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{F}) \cong \text{MSpec}(N \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C})$ in $\mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$. These identify $\text{MSpec}(\alpha \otimes \text{id}_{\mathfrak{C}}) : \text{MSpec}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{MSpec}(N \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C})$ with $\underline{f}^*(\text{MSpec } \alpha) : \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Write $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, $\underline{Y} = (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ and $\underline{f} = (f, f^\#)$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is the sheafification of the presheaf $V \mapsto M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathcal{O}_Y(V)$, and $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E})$ is the sheafifica-

tion of the presheaf $U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \mathcal{E}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$. These two sheafifications combine into one, so $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E})$ is the sheafification of the presheaf $U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} (M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathcal{O}_Y(V)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$. But $(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathcal{O}_Y(V)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong (M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, so this is canonically isomorphic to the presheaf $U \mapsto (M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C}) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ whose sheafification is $\mathrm{MSpec}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C})$. This gives a natural isomorphism $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}) \cong \mathrm{MSpec}(M \otimes_{\mathfrak{D}} \mathfrak{C})$. The same holds for N . The identification of $\mathrm{MSpec}(\alpha \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathfrak{C}})$ and $\underline{f}^*(\mathrm{MSpec} \alpha)$ follows by passing from morphisms of presheaves to morphisms of the associated sheaves. $\square$

6.3 Quasicoherent and coherent sheaves on C^∞ -schemes

Here is our definition of quasicoherent and coherent sheaves.

Definition 6.9. Let $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a C^∞ -scheme, and $\mathcal{E}$ a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules. We call $\mathcal{E}$ *quasicoherent* if X can be covered by open subsets U with $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U) \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathfrak{C}$ for some C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$, and under this identification $\mathcal{E}|_U$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{MSpec} M$ for some $\mathfrak{C}$ -module M . We call $\mathcal{E}$ *coherent* if furthermore we can take these $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules M to be finitely presented. We call $\mathcal{E}$ a *vector bundle of rank $n \geq 0$* if X may be covered by open U such that $\mathcal{E}|_U \cong \mathcal{O}_X|_U \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^n$. Vector bundles are coherent sheaves. Write $\mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X})$ and $\mathrm{coh}(\underline{X})$ for the full subcategories of quasicoherent and coherent sheaves in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, respectively.

Remark 6.10. Our definition of quasicoherent sheaves follows Hartshorne [17, p. 111] in conventional algebraic geometry exactly, replacing schemes by C^∞ -schemes. However, our definition of coherent sheaf is not standard. The C^∞ -rings $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ we are interested in are generally *not noetherian* as commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras, and this causes problems with coherence.

In the non-noetherian case, the notions of coherent sheaf in Hartshorne [17, p. 111] and Grothendieck [16, §0.5.3] are not equivalent. Hartshorne's definition, which Grothendieck calls sheaves of *finite type* [16, §0.5.2], requires the $\mathfrak{C}$ -modules M to be finitely generated rather than finitely presented, and is too weak for our purposes. Grothendieck's definition is too strong: if X is a manifold of positive dimension and $E \rightarrow X$ a vector bundle of positive rank, the corresponding $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $\mathcal{E}$ over $\underline{X}$ is never coherent in Grothendieck's sense, and even $\mathcal{O}_X$ is not coherent. Our definition of coherent sheaf, which correspond to *finitely presented quasicoherent sheaves* as in [16, §0.5.2.5], is intermediate between those of Hartshorne and Grothendieck.

We are mainly interested in sheaves on locally fair C^∞ -schemes. In this case Theorem 6.7(b) implies:

Corollary 6.11. *Let $\underline{X}$ be a locally fair C^∞ -scheme. Then every $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $\mathcal{E}$ on $\underline{X}$ is quasicoherent, that is, $\mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X}) = \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$.*

The following proposition is elementary, using ideas in [16, §0.4–§0.5]. The middle part holds as if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a C^∞ -ring then $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}^{\mathrm{fp}}$ is closed under cokernels and extensions in $\mathfrak{C}\text{-mod}$, but may not be closed under kernels, as in Definition 5.1.

Proposition 6.12. *Let $\underline{X}$ be a C^∞ -scheme. Then $\mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X})$ is closed under kernels, cokernels and extensions in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, so it is an **abelian category**. The full subcategory $\mathrm{coh}(\underline{X})$ of $\mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X})$ is in general **not** an abelian category, even in the case when $\underline{X} = F_{\mathrm{Man}^c}^{C^\infty\mathrm{Sch}}(X)$ for some manifold X of positive dimension, because the C^∞ -rings $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ for open $U \subseteq X$ need not be noetherian as commutative $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras. However, if $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X})$ or $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ and $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}$ are coherent, then $\mathcal{G}$ is coherent, or if $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}$ are coherent, then $\mathcal{F}$ is coherent. That is, $\mathrm{coh}(\underline{X})$ is closed under cokernels and extensions in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, but may not be closed under kernels in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$.*

Suppose $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is a morphism of C^∞ -schemes. Then pullback $f^* : \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ takes quasicohherent sheaves to quasicohherent sheaves and coherent sheaves to coherent sheaves. Thus $f^* : \mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{Y}) \rightarrow \mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X})$ is a right exact functor, by Proposition 6.5.

As in Godement [14, §II.3.7] or Voisin [41, Def. 4.35], a sheaf of abelian groups $\mathcal{E}$ on a topological space X is called *fine* if for any open cover of X , a subordinate partition of unity exists in the sheaf $\mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$. In particular, if $\mathcal{O}_X$ is a sheaf of rings on X for which partitions of unity exist subordinate to any open cover, then every sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules $\mathcal{E}$ is fine. Therefore by Proposition 4.28, if $\underline{X}$ is a separated, paracompact, locally fair C^∞ -scheme, then quasicohherent sheaves on $\underline{X}$ are fine.

A fundamental property [41, Prop. 4.36] of fine sheaves $\mathcal{E}$ is that their cohomology groups $H^i(\mathcal{E})$ are zero for all $i > 0$. This means that H^0 is an exact functor on fine sheaves, rather than just left exact, since H^1 measures the failure of H^0 to be right exact. But $H^0(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}(X)$, and more generally $H^0(\mathcal{E}|_U) = \mathcal{E}(U)$ for open $U \subseteq X$. Thus we deduce:

Proposition 6.13. *Suppose $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a separated, paracompact, locally fair C^∞ -scheme, and $\cdots \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^i \xrightarrow{\phi^i} \mathcal{E}^{i+1} \xrightarrow{\phi^{i+1}} \mathcal{E}^{i+2} \rightarrow \cdots$ an exact sequence in $\mathrm{qcoh}(\underline{X})$. Then $\cdots \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^i(U) \xrightarrow{\phi^i(U)} \mathcal{E}^{i+1}(U) \xrightarrow{\phi^{i+1}(U)} \mathcal{E}^{i+2}(U) \rightarrow \cdots$ is an exact sequence of $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -modules for each open $U \subseteq X$.*

6.4 Cotangent sheaves of C^∞ -schemes

We now define *cotangent sheaves*, the sheaf version of cotangent modules in §5.

Definition 6.14. Let $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ be a C^∞ -ringed space. Define $\mathcal{PT}^*\underline{X}$ to associate to each open $U \subseteq X$ the cotangent module $(\Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}, \mu_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)})$ of Definition 5.10, regarded as a module over the C^∞ -ring $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$, and to each inclusion of open sets $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$ the morphism of $\mathcal{O}_X(U)$ -modules $\Omega_{\rho_{UV}} : \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)}$ associated to the morphism of C^∞ -rings $\rho_{UV} : \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(V)$. Then as we want for (28) the following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \times \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}} & \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} \\ \downarrow \rho_{UV} \times \Omega_{\rho_{UV}} & & \Omega_{\rho_{UV}} \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(V) \times \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)}} & \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(V)}. \end{array}$$

Using this and functoriality of cotangent modules $\Omega_{\psi \circ \phi} = \Omega_\psi \circ \Omega_\phi$ in Definition 5.10, we see that $\mathcal{PT}^* \underline{X}$ is a *presheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules on $\underline{X}$* . Define the *cotangent sheaf $T^* \underline{X}$ of $\underline{X}$* to be the sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules associated to $\mathcal{PT}^* \underline{X}$.

If $U \subseteq X$ is open then we have an equality of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X|_U$ -modules

$$T^*(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U) = T^* \underline{X}|_U. \quad (31)$$

As in Example 5.11, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a smooth map of manifolds we have a morphism $(df)^* : f^*(T^*Y) \rightarrow T^*X$ of vector bundles over X . Here is an analogue for C^∞ -ringed spaces. Let $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ be a morphism of C^∞ -ringed spaces. Then by Definition 6.3, $\underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{Y})$ is the sheafification of the presheaf $U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} T^*\underline{Y}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, and $T^*\underline{Y}$ is the sheafification of the presheaf $\mathcal{PT}^*\underline{Y}$. These two sheafifications combine into one, so that $\underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{Y})$ is the sheafification of the presheaf $\underline{f}^*(\mathcal{PT}^*\underline{Y})$ acting by

$$\begin{aligned} U \mapsto \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{PT}^*\underline{Y})(U) &= \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \mathcal{PT}^*\underline{Y}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \\ &= \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U). \end{aligned}$$

Define a morphism of presheaves $\mathcal{P}\Omega_{\underline{f}} : \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{PT}^*\underline{Y}) \rightarrow \mathcal{PT}^* \underline{X}$ on X by

$$(\mathcal{P}\Omega_{\underline{f}})(U) = \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} (\Omega_{\rho_{f^{-1}(V)} U \circ f^\#(V)})_*,$$

where $(\Omega_{\rho_{f^{-1}(V)} U \circ f^\#(V)})_* : \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} = (\mathcal{PT}^* \underline{X})(U)$ is constructed as in Definition 5.10 from the C^∞ -ring morphisms $f^\#(V) : \mathcal{O}_Y(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(f^{-1}(V))$ in $\underline{f}$ and $\rho_{f^{-1}(V)} U : \mathcal{O}_X(f^{-1}(V)) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ in $\mathcal{O}_X$. Define $\Omega_{\underline{f}} : \underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{Y}) \rightarrow T^* \underline{X}$ to be the induced morphism of the associated sheaves.

Remark 6.15. There is an alternative definition of the cotangent sheaf $T^* \underline{X}$ of $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ following Hartshorne [17, p. 175]. We can form the product $\underline{X} \times \underline{X} = (X \times X, \mathcal{O}_{X \times X})$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{RS}$, and there is a natural diagonal morphism $\underline{\Delta}_X : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{X} \times \underline{X}$. Write $\mathcal{I}$ for the sheaf of ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{X \times X}$ associated to $\underline{\Delta}_X$, that is, for open $U \subseteq X \times X$, $\mathcal{I}(U) = \text{Ker}(\Delta_X^\#(U) : \mathcal{O}_{X \times X}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta_X^{-1}(U)))$, as an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{X \times X}(U)$. Then $T^* \underline{X} \cong \underline{\Delta}_X^*(\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^2)$. This can be proved using the equivalence of two definitions of cotangent module in [17, Prop. II.8.1A].

Here are some properties of cotangent sheaves:

Theorem 6.16. (a) Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a finitely generated C^∞ -ring and $\underline{X} = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$. Then there is a canonical isomorphism $T^* \underline{X} \cong \text{MSpec } \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$.

(b) Let $\underline{X}$ be a fair affine C^∞ -scheme. Then $\mathcal{PT}^* \underline{X}$ in Definition 6.14 is a sheaf, so that $\mathcal{PT}^* \underline{X} \cong T^* \underline{X}$ and $(T^* \underline{X})(U) \cong \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}$ for all open $U \subseteq X$.

(c) Let $\underline{X}$ be a locally good C^∞ -scheme. Then $T^* \underline{X}$ is a coherent sheaf.

(d) Suppose X is an n -manifold, which may have boundary or corners, and $\underline{X} = F_{\text{Man}^c}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty \text{Sch}}(X)$ in the notation of Definition 4.13. Then $T^* \underline{X}$ is a rank n vector bundle on $\underline{X}$, with $(T^* \underline{X})(U) \cong C^\infty(T^*X|_U)$ for all open $U \subseteq X$. When $X = \mathbb{R}_k^n := [0, \infty)^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ we have $T^*(\underline{\mathbb{R}}_k^n) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}_k^n} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$.

Proof. For (a), let $U \subseteq X$ be open. Then by Proposition 4.17 there exists a characteristic function $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ for U , and Proposition 4.21 gives a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_X(U) \cong R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}])$. Propositions 5.14 and 5.15 then give

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)} &\cong \Omega_{R_{\text{fg}}^{\text{fa}}(\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}])} \cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]} \mathcal{O}_X(U)) \\ &\cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}((\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]) \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}[c^{-1}]} \mathcal{O}_X(U)) \cong R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the presheaf $\mathcal{P}T^*(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ in Definition 6.14 is canonically isomorphic to the presheaf $U \mapsto R_{\text{all}}^{\text{co}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}} \otimes_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{O}_X(U))$. But by Theorem 6.7(d), this presheaf is canonically isomorphic to the sheaf $\text{MSpec } \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$, proving (a). Also, this shows that the presheaf $\mathcal{P}T^*(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a sheaf when $\underline{X} = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for $\mathfrak{C}$ fair. Since this only depends on $\underline{X}$ up to isomorphism, part (b) follows.

For (c), as $\underline{X}$ is locally good it can be covered by open $U \subseteq X$ with $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for some good C^∞ -ring $\mathfrak{C}$. By (a), this isomorphism identifies $T^*\underline{X}|_U$ with $\text{MSpec } \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Since $\Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is finitely presented by Theorem 5.13, $T^*\underline{X}$ is coherent. For (d), as $T^*\mathbb{R}_k^n \cong \mathbb{R}_k^n \times (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ we have $\Omega_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^n)} \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_k^n) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$, and thus $T^*(\mathbb{R}_k^n) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{R}_k^n} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ by (a). Any n -manifold X can be covered by open U diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}_k^n$, so that $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U) \cong \mathbb{R}_k^n$ and $T^*\underline{X}|_U \cong \mathcal{O}_X|_U \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ by (31). Hence $T^*\underline{X}$ is a vector bundle of rank n . $\square$

Here are some important properties of the morphisms $\Omega_{\underline{f}}$ in Definition 6.14. Equation (34) is an analogue of (21) and (27).

Theorem 6.17. (a) Let $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ and $\underline{g} : \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ be morphisms of C^∞ -schemes. Then

$$\Omega_{\underline{g} \circ \underline{f}} = \Omega_{\underline{f}} \circ \underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}) \circ I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(T^*\underline{Z}) \quad (32)$$

as morphisms $(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(T^*\underline{Z}) \rightarrow T^*\underline{X}$ in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$. Here $\Omega_{\underline{g}} : \underline{g}^*(T^*\underline{Z}) \rightarrow T^*\underline{Y}$ in $\mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$, so applying $\underline{f}^*$ gives $\underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}) : \underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(T^*\underline{Z})) \rightarrow \underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{Y})$ in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, and $I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(T^*\underline{Z}) : (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(T^*\underline{Z}) \rightarrow \underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(T^*\underline{Z}))$ is as in Remark 6.4.

(b) Suppose $\underline{W}, \underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ are locally fair C^∞ -schemes with a Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \underline{Y} \\ \downarrow \underline{e} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\underline{f}} \\ \xrightarrow{\underline{g}} \end{array} & \downarrow \underline{h} \\ \underline{X} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \underline{Z} \end{array} \quad (33)$$

in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}$, so that $\underline{W} = \underline{X} \times_{\underline{Z}} \underline{Y}$. Then the following is exact in $\text{qcoh}(\underline{W})$:

$$(\underline{g} \circ \underline{e})^*(T^*\underline{Z}) \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c} \underline{e}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}) \circ I_{\underline{e}, \underline{g}}(T^*\underline{Z}) \oplus \\ -\underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{h}}) \circ I_{\underline{f}, \underline{h}}(T^*\underline{Z}) \end{array}} \underline{e}^*(T^*\underline{X}) \oplus \underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{Y}) \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\underline{e}} \oplus \Omega_{\underline{f}}} T^*\underline{W} \rightarrow 0. \quad (34)$$

Proof. Combining two or three sheafifications into one as in the proof of Proposition 6.8, we see that the sheaves $T^*\underline{X}, \underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{Y}), \underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(T^*\underline{Z}))$ and $(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(T^*\underline{Z})$

on $\underline{X}$ are isomorphic to the sheafifications of the following presheaves:

$$T^* \underline{X} \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_X(U)}, \quad (35)$$

$$\underline{f}^*(T^* \underline{Y}) \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U), \quad (36)$$

$$\underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(T^* \underline{Z})) \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \lim_{W \supseteq g(V)} (\Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \mathcal{O}_Y(V)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U), \quad (37)$$

$$(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(T^* \underline{Z}) \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{W \supseteq g \circ f(U)} \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \mathcal{O}_X(U). \quad (38)$$

Then $\Omega_{\underline{f}}, \Omega_{\underline{g} \circ \underline{f}}, \underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}), I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(T^* \underline{Z})$ are the morphisms of sheaves associated to the following morphisms of the presheaves in (35)–(38):

$$\Omega_{\underline{f}} \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} (\Omega_{\rho_{f^{-1}(V)} U \circ f^\#(V)})_*, \quad (39)$$

$$\Omega_{\underline{g} \circ \underline{f}} \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{W \supseteq g \circ f(U)} (\Omega_{\rho_{(g \circ f)^{-1}(W)} U \circ (g \circ f)^\#(W)})_*, \quad (40)$$

$$\underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}) \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \lim_{W \supseteq g(V)} (\Omega_{\rho_{g^{-1}(W)} V \circ g^\#(W)})_*, \quad (41)$$

$$I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(T^* \underline{Z}) \rightsquigarrow U \mapsto \lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \lim_{W \supseteq g(V)} I_{UVW}, \quad (42)$$

where $I_{UVW} : \Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \mathcal{O}_X(U) \rightarrow (\Omega_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z(W)} \mathcal{O}_Y(V)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Y(V)} \mathcal{O}_X(U)$ is the natural isomorphism.

Now if $U \subseteq X$, $V \subseteq Y$, $W \subseteq Z$ are open with $V \supseteq f(U)$, $W \supseteq g(V)$ then

$$\rho_{(g \circ f)^{-1}(W)} U \circ (g \circ f)^\#(W) = [\rho_{f^{-1}(V)} U \circ f^\#(V)] \circ [\rho_{g^{-1}(W)} V \circ g^\#(W)]$$

as morphisms $\mathcal{O}_Z(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, so $\Omega_{\phi \circ \psi} = \Omega_\phi \circ \Omega_\psi$ in Definition 5.10 implies

$$(\Omega_{\rho_{(g \circ f)^{-1}(W)} U \circ (g \circ f)^\#(W)})_* = (\Omega_{\rho_{f^{-1}(V)} U \circ f^\#(V)})_* \circ (\Omega_{\rho_{g^{-1}(W)} V \circ g^\#(W)})_* \circ I_{UVW}.$$

Taking limits $\lim_{V \supseteq f(U)} \lim_{W \supseteq g(V)}$ implies that the presheaves in (39)–(42) satisfy the analogue of (32), so passing to morphisms of sheaves proves (a).

For (b), first observe that as (33) is commutative, by (a) we have $\Omega_{\underline{e}} \circ \underline{e}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}) \circ I_{\underline{e}, \underline{g}}(T^* \underline{Z}) = \Omega_{\underline{g} \circ \underline{e}} = \Omega_{\underline{h} \circ \underline{f}} = \Omega_{\underline{f}} \circ \underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{h}}) \circ I_{\underline{f}, \underline{h}}(T^* \underline{Z})$, so $\Omega_{\underline{e}} \circ (\underline{e}^*(\Omega_{\underline{g}}) \circ I_{\underline{e}, \underline{g}}(T^* \underline{Z})) - \Omega_{\underline{f}} \circ (\underline{f}^*(\Omega_{\underline{h}}) \circ I_{\underline{f}, \underline{h}}(T^* \underline{Z})) = 0$, and (34) is a complex. To show it is exact, since exactness is a local condition it is enough to show that W can be covered by open sets $W' \subseteq W$ with the restriction of (34) to W' exact.

Let $(x, y) \in W$, so that $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ with $f(x) = g(y) = z \in Z$. As $\underline{Z}$ is locally fair we can choose an open neighbourhood Z' of $z \in Z$ with $\underline{Z}' = (Z', \mathcal{O}_Z|_{Z'}) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ a finitely generated C^∞ -ring. As $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ are locally fair we can choose open neighbourhoods X' of x in $f^{-1}(Z') \subseteq X$ and Y' of y in $g^{-1}(Z') \subseteq Y$ with $\underline{X}' = (X', \mathcal{O}_X|_{X'}) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{D}$, $\underline{Y}' = (Y', \mathcal{O}_Y|_{Y'}) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{E}$ for $\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E}$ finitely generated C^∞ -rings. Set $W = X' \cap Y' \cap W$, and $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{D} \amalg_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{E}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}$ is a finitely generated C^∞ -ring, and W' is an open neighbourhood of (x, y) in W with $\underline{W}' = (W', \mathcal{O}_W|_{W'}) \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{F}$, since Spec preserves limits.

Theorem 6.16(a) now shows that the isomorphisms $\underline{W}' \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{F}, \dots, \underline{Z}' \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ identify $T^* \underline{W}' \cong \text{MSpec } \Omega_{\mathfrak{F}}, \dots, T^* \underline{Z}' \cong \text{MSpec } \Omega_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Theorem 5.16 gives

an exact sequence of $\mathfrak{F}$ -modules (21). Applying the exact functor MSpec gives an exact sequence in $\text{qcoh}(\underline{W}')$. Using the identifications above and Proposition 6.8, this exact sequence is identified with the restriction of (34) to W' . Thus we may cover W by open subsets W' such that (34) is exact on W' . $\square$

7 Background material on stacks

In §8 we will study C^∞ -stacks, that is, various classes of stacks on the site $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ of C^∞ -schemes with the open cover topology. As a preparation for this we now recall some background we will need on stacks. This section explains theory for stacks on an arbitrary site $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ satisfying various extra conditions, and §8 covers material specific to C^∞ -schemes and C^∞ -stacks.

Nothing in this section is really new, although our presentation is not always standard. Where there are several equivalent ways of presenting something, for instance, defining Grothendieck topologies using either coverings or sieves, we have chosen one. Our principal references are Artin [2], Behrend et al. [3], Gomez [15], Laumon and Moret-Bailly [24], Metzler [28], and Noohi [34].

The topological and smooth stacks discussed by Metzler and Noohi are closer to our situation than the stacks in algebraic geometry of [3, 15, 24], so we often follow [28, 34], particularly in §7.5 which is based on Metzler [28, §3]. Heinloth [18] and Behrend and Xu [4] also discuss smooth stacks.

7.1 Grothendieck topologies, sites, prestacks, and stacks

Definition 7.1. A *Grothendieck topology* $\mathcal{J}$ on a category $\mathcal{C}$ is a collection of families $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ called *coverings*, satisfying:

- (i) If $\varphi : V \rightarrow U$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{C}$, then $\{\varphi : V \rightarrow U\}$ is a covering;
- (ii) If $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering, and $\{\psi_{ab} : V_{ab} \rightarrow U_a\}_{b \in B_a}$ is a covering for all $a \in A$, then $\{\varphi_a \circ \psi_{ab} : V_{ab} \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A, b \in B_a}$ is a covering.
- (iii) If $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering and $\psi : V \rightarrow U$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ then $\{\pi_V : U_a \times_{\varphi_a, U, \psi} V \rightarrow V\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering, where the fibre product $U_a \times_U V$ exists in $\mathcal{C}$ for all $a \in A$.

A *site* $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is a category $\mathcal{C}$ with a Grothendieck topology $\mathcal{J}$.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category. A *category fibred in groupoids over $\mathcal{C}$* is a functor $p_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is a category, such that given any morphism $g : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and $X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(X_2) = C_2$, there exists a morphism $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ in $\mathcal{X}$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(f) = g$, and given commutative diagrams (on the left) in $\mathcal{X}$, in which g is to be determined, and (on the right) in $\mathcal{C}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X_1 & \xrightarrow{\quad g \quad} & X_2 \\
 & \searrow f \quad \swarrow h & \\
 & X_3 &
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 p_{\mathcal{X}}(X_1) & \xrightarrow{\quad g' \quad} & p_{\mathcal{X}}(X_2) \\
 & \searrow p_{\mathcal{X}}(f) \quad \swarrow p_{\mathcal{X}}(h) & \\
 & p_{\mathcal{X}}(X_3) &
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{c}
 p_{\mathcal{X}} \\
 \rightsquigarrow
 \end{array}
 \quad (43)$$

then there exists a unique morphism g as shown with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(g) = g'$ and $f = h \circ g$. Often we refer to $\mathcal{X}$ as the category fibred in groupoids (or prestack, or stack, etc.), leaving $p_{\mathcal{X}}$ implicit.

Definition 7.3. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site, and $p_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a category fibred in groupoids over $\mathcal{C}$. We call $\mathcal{X}$ a *prestack* if whenever $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering family in $\mathcal{J}$ and we are given commutative diagrams in $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{C}$ for all $a, b \in A$, in which f is to be determined:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & X_{ab} \longrightarrow Y_{ab} & \\
 X_a \swarrow & & \searrow Y_a \\
 & X_b \xrightarrow{y_a} Y_b & \\
 x_a \searrow & & \swarrow y_b \\
 & X \xrightarrow{f} Y &
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{p_{\mathcal{X}}}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & U_a \times_U U_b \xrightarrow{\pi_{U_b}} U_b & \\
 U_a \swarrow & & \searrow U_a \\
 & U \xrightarrow{\varphi_a} U & \\
 \varphi_a \searrow & & \swarrow \varphi_b \\
 & U \xrightarrow{\varphi_b} U &
 \end{array}
 \quad (44)$$

then there exists a unique $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{X}$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(f) = \text{id}_U$ making (44) commute for all $a \in A$.

Let $p_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a prestack. We call $\mathcal{X}$ a *stack* if whenever $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering family in $\mathcal{J}$ and we are given commutative diagrams in $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{C}$ for all $a, b, c \in A$, with $X_{ab} = X_{ba}$, $X_{abc} = X_{bac} = X_{acb}$, etc., in which the object X and morphisms x_a are to be determined:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & X_{abc} \longrightarrow X_{ac} & \\
 X_{ab} \swarrow & & \searrow X_a \\
 & X_a \xrightarrow{x_a} X_c & \\
 x_{ba} \searrow & & \swarrow x_c \\
 & X \xrightarrow{x_c} X &
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{p_{\mathcal{X}}}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & U_a \times_U U_b \times_U U_c \longrightarrow U_a \times_U U_c & \\
 U_a \times_U U_b \swarrow & & \searrow U_a \\
 & U_b \times_U U_c \xrightarrow{\varphi_c} U_c & \\
 \varphi_b \searrow & & \swarrow \varphi_c \\
 & U \xrightarrow{\varphi_c} U &
 \end{array}
 \quad (45)$$

then there exists $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and morphisms $x_a : X_a \rightarrow X$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(x_a) = \varphi_a$ for all $a \in A$, making (45) commute for all $a, b, c \in A$.

Thus, in a prestack we have a sheaf-like condition allowing us to glue morphisms in $\mathcal{X}$ uniquely over open covers in $\mathcal{C}$; in a stack we also have a sheaf-like condition allowing us to glue objects in $\mathcal{X}$ over open covers in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 7.4. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site. A *1-morphism* between stacks or prestacks $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is a functor $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with $p_{\mathcal{Y}} \circ F = p_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. If $F, G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ are 1-morphisms, a *2-morphism* $\eta : F \Rightarrow G$ is an isomorphism of functors. That is, for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ we are given an isomorphism $\eta(X) : F(X) \rightarrow G(X)$ in $\mathcal{Y}$ such that if $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{X}$ then $\eta(X_2) \circ F(f) = G(f) \circ \eta(X_1) : F(X_1) \rightarrow G(X_2)$ in $\mathcal{Y}$. With these definitions, the stacks and prestacks on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ form (strict) 2-categories, which we write as $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ and $\mathbf{Presta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$.

A *substack* $\mathcal{Y}$ of a stack $\mathcal{X}$ is a strictly full subcategory $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $p_{\mathcal{Y}} := p_{\mathcal{X}}|_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a stack. The inclusion functor $i_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is then a 1-morphism of stacks.

We will not define 2-categories, but some useful references on 2-categories for stack theory are [3, App. B] and [15, App. B]. In a 2-category $\mathcal{C}$, there

are three notions of when objects X, Y in $\mathcal{C}$ are ‘the same’: *equality* $X = Y$, and *isomorphism*, that is we have 1-morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $g : Y \rightarrow X$ with $g \circ f = \text{id}_X$ and $f \circ g = \text{id}_Y$, and *equivalence*, that is we have 1-morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $g : Y \rightarrow X$ and 2-isomorphisms $\eta : g \circ f \Rightarrow \text{id}_X$ and $\zeta : f \circ g \Rightarrow \text{id}_Y$. Usually the weakest notion, equivalence, is the right one to use. We write $X \simeq Y$ to mean X is equivalent to Y .

If X, Y are objects in $\mathcal{C}$ and $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ are 1-morphisms then $f \cong g$ means f is 2-isomorphic to g . Write $\mathbf{Hom}(X, Y)$ for the category with objects 1-morphisms $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and morphisms 2-morphisms $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$ in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 7.5. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site, and $\mathcal{X}$ a prestack on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$, so that $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ and $\mathbf{Presta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ are 2-categories. A *stack associated to $\mathcal{X}$* , or *stackification of $\mathcal{X}$* , is a stack $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ with a 1-morphism of prestacks $i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}$, such that for every stack $\mathcal{Y}$, composition with i yields an equivalence of categories $\mathbf{Hom}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{i^*} \mathbf{Hom}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$.

As in [24, Lem. 3.2], every prestack has an associated stack, just as every presheaf has an associated sheaf.

Proposition 7.6. *For every prestack $\mathcal{X}$ on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ there exists an associated stack $i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}$, which is unique up to equivalence in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$.*

7.2 Commutative diagrams and fibre products

Commutative diagrams in 2-categories should in general only commute *up to (specified) 2-isomorphisms*, rather than strictly. A simple example of a commutative diagram in a 2-category $\mathcal{C}$ is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & Y \\ & \nearrow f & \searrow g \\ X & & Z \\ & \xrightarrow{h} & \end{array}$$

$\Downarrow \eta$

which means that X, Y, Z are objects of $\mathcal{C}$, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ and $h : X \rightarrow Z$ are 1-morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$, and $\eta : g \circ f \Rightarrow h$ is a 2-isomorphism. We define *fibre products* in 2-categories, following [3, §3, Def. B.13].

Definition 7.7. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a 2-category and $f : X \rightarrow Z$, $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ be 1-morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$. A *fibre product* $X \times_Z Y$ in $\mathcal{C}$ consists of an object W , 1-morphisms $\pi_X : W \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_Y : W \rightarrow Y$ and a 2-isomorphism $\eta : f \circ \pi_X \Rightarrow g \circ \pi_Y$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with the following universal property: suppose $\pi'_X : W' \rightarrow X$ and $\pi'_Y : W' \rightarrow Y$ are 1-morphisms and $\eta' : f \circ \pi'_X \Rightarrow g \circ \pi'_Y$ is a 2-isomorphism in $\mathcal{C}$. Then there should exist a 1-morphism $h : W' \rightarrow W$ and 2-isomorphisms $\zeta_X : \pi_X \circ h \Rightarrow \pi'_X$, $\zeta_Y : \pi_Y \circ h \Rightarrow \pi'_Y$ such that the following diagram of 2-isomorphisms commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f \circ \pi_X \circ h & \xRightarrow{\eta \circ \text{id}_h} & g \circ \pi_Y \circ h \\ \text{id}_f * \zeta_X \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \text{id}_g * \zeta_Y \\ f \circ \pi'_X & \xRightarrow{\eta'} & g \circ \pi'_Y. \end{array}$$

Furthermore, if $\tilde{h}, \tilde{\zeta}_X, \tilde{\zeta}_Y$ are alternative choices of h, ζ_X, ζ_Y then there should exist a unique 2-isomorphism $\theta : \tilde{h} \rightarrow h$ with

$$\tilde{\zeta}_X = \zeta_X \odot (\text{id}_{\pi_X} * \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\zeta}_Y = \zeta_Y \odot (\text{id}_{\pi_Y} * \theta).$$

Here we write $g \circ f : X \rightarrow Z$ for the *horizontal composition of 1-morphisms* $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $g : Y \rightarrow Z$, and $\zeta \odot \eta : f \Rightarrow h$ for the *vertical composition of 2-morphisms* $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$, $\zeta : g \Rightarrow h$, and $\zeta * \eta : g \circ f \Rightarrow g' \circ f'$ for the *horizontal composition of 2-morphisms* $\eta : f \Rightarrow f'$, $\zeta : g \rightarrow g'$ in $\mathcal{C}$. If a fibre product $X \times_Z Y$ in $\mathcal{C}$ exists then it is unique up to equivalence. Given a fibre product in $\mathcal{C}$ as above, the following is called a *2-Cartesian diagram*:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Y \\ \pi_X \downarrow & \nearrow \eta & \downarrow g \\ X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Z. \end{array}$$

In the 2-category $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ of stacks on a site $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$, there is a natural construction of fibre products: if $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ are stacks and $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}, G : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ are 1-morphisms, define a category $\mathcal{W}$ to have objects (X, Y, α) , where $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\alpha : F(X) \rightarrow G(Y)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{Z}$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(X) = p_{\mathcal{Y}}(Y) = U$ and $p_{\mathcal{X}}(\alpha) = \text{id}_U$ in $\mathcal{C}$, and for objects $(X_1, Y_1, \alpha_1), (X_2, Y_2, \alpha_2)$ in $\mathcal{W}$ a morphism $(f, g) : (X_1, Y_1, \alpha_1) \rightarrow (X_2, Y_2, \alpha_2)$ in $\mathcal{W}$ is a pair of morphisms $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ in $\mathcal{X}$ and $g : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$ in $\mathcal{Y}$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(f) = p_{\mathcal{Y}}(g) = \varphi : U \rightarrow V$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha_2 \circ F(f) = G(g) \circ \alpha_1 : F(X_1) \rightarrow G(Y_2)$ in $\mathcal{Z}$. Then $\mathcal{W}$ is a stack over $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$.

Define 1-morphisms $p_{\mathcal{W}} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by $p_{\mathcal{W}} : (X, Y, \alpha) \mapsto p_{\mathcal{X}}(X)$ and $p_{\mathcal{W}} : (f, g) \mapsto p_{\mathcal{X}}(f)$, and $\pi_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ by $\pi_{\mathcal{X}} : (X, Y, \alpha) \mapsto X$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{X}} : (f, g) \mapsto f$, and $\pi_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ by $\pi_{\mathcal{Y}} : (X, Y, \alpha) \mapsto Y$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{Y}} : (f, g) \mapsto g$. Define a 2-morphism $\eta : F \circ \pi_{\mathcal{X}} \Rightarrow G \circ \pi_{\mathcal{Y}}$ by $\eta(X, Y, \alpha) = \alpha$. Then $\mathcal{W}, \pi_{\mathcal{X}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Y}}, \eta$ is a fibre product $\mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Y}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$.

The functor $\text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a *terminal object* in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$, and may be thought of as a point $*$. Products $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ are fibre products over $*$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is a stack, the *diagonal 1-morphism* is the natural 1-morphism $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$. The *inertia stack* $I_{\mathcal{X}}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is the fibre product $\mathcal{X} \times_{\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}, \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}} \mathcal{X}$, with natural *inertia 1-morphism* $\iota_{\mathcal{X}} : I_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ from projection to the first factor of $\mathcal{X}$. Then we have a 2-Cartesian diagram in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I_{\mathcal{X}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \\ \iota_{\mathcal{X}} \downarrow & \nearrow \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} & \downarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}. \end{array} \tag{46}$$

There is also a natural 1-morphism $j_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow I_{\mathcal{X}}$ induced by the 1-morphism $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}$ from $\mathcal{X}$ to the two factors $\mathcal{X}$ in $I_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{X}$ and the identity 2-morphism on $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$.

7.3 Descent theory on a site

The theory of descent in algebraic geometry, due to Grothendieck, says that objects and morphisms over a scheme U can be described locally on an open

cover $\{U_i : i \in I\}$ of U . It is described by Behrend et al. [3, App. A], and at length by Vistoli [40]. We shall express descent as conditions on a general site $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$.

Definition 7.8. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site. We say that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ *has descent for objects* if whenever $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering in $\mathcal{J}$ and we are given morphisms $f_a : X_a \rightarrow U_a$ in $\mathcal{C}$ for all $a \in A$ and isomorphisms $g_{ab} : X_a \times_{\varphi_a \circ f_a, U, \varphi_b} U_b \rightarrow X_b \times_{\varphi_b \circ f_b, U, \varphi_a} U_a$ in $\mathcal{C}$ for all $a, b \in A$ with $g_{ab} = g_{ba}^{-1}$ such that for all $a, b, c \in A$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_a \times_{\varphi_a \circ f_a, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \times_{\pi_U, U, \varphi_c} U_c & \xrightarrow{g_{ab} \times \text{id}_{U_c}} & (X_b \times_{\varphi_b \circ f_b, U, \varphi_c} U_c) \times_{\pi_U, U, \varphi_a} U_a \cong \\ (X_a \times_{\varphi_a \circ f_a, U, \varphi_c} U_c) \times_{\pi_U, U, \varphi_b} U_b & \xleftarrow{g_{ba} \times \text{id}_{U_c}} & (X_b \times_{\varphi_b \circ f_b, U, \varphi_a} U_a) \times_{\pi_U, U, \varphi_c} U_c \\ & \searrow g_{ca} \times \text{id}_{U_b} \quad \swarrow g_{ac} \times \text{id}_{U_b} \quad \searrow g_{cb} \times \text{id}_{U_a} \quad \swarrow g_{bc} \times \text{id}_{U_a} & \\ & (X_c \times_{\varphi_c \circ f_c, U, \varphi_a} U_a) \times_{\pi_U, U, \varphi_b} U_b \cong & \\ & (X_c \times_{\varphi_c \circ f_c, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \times_{\pi_U, U, \varphi_a} U_a, & \end{array}$$

then there exist a morphism $f : X \rightarrow U$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and isomorphisms $g_a : X_a \rightarrow X \times_{f, U, \varphi_a} U_a$ for all $a \in A$ such that $f_a = \pi_{U_a} \circ g_a$ and the diagram below commutes for all $a, b \in A$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_a \times_{\varphi_a \circ f_a, U, \varphi_b} U_b & \xrightarrow{g_a \times \text{id}_{U_b}} & (X \times_{f, U, \varphi_a} U_a) \times_{\varphi_a \circ \pi_{U_a}, U, \varphi_b} U_b \\ \downarrow g_{ab} & & \downarrow \cong \\ & & X \times_{f, U, \pi_U} (U_a \times_{\varphi_a, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \\ & & \downarrow \cong \\ X_b \times_{\varphi_b \circ f_b, U, \varphi_a} U_a & \xleftarrow{g_b^{-1} \times \text{id}_{U_a}} & (X \times_{f, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \times_{\varphi_b \circ \pi_{U_b}, U, \varphi_a} U_a. \end{array}$$

Furthermore X, f should be unique up to canonical isomorphism. Note that all the fibre products used above exist in $\mathcal{C}$ by Definition 7.1(iii).

Definition 7.9. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site. We say that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ *has descent for morphisms* if whenever $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering in $\mathcal{J}$ and $f : X \rightarrow U$, $g : Y \rightarrow U$ and $h_a : X \times_{f, U, \varphi_a} U_a \rightarrow Y \times_{g, U, \varphi_a} U_a$ for all $a \in A$ are morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\pi_{U_a} \circ h_a = \pi_{U_a}$ and for all $a, b \in A$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X \times_{f, U, \varphi_a} U_a) \times_{\varphi_a \circ \pi_{U_a}, U, \varphi_b} U_b & \xrightarrow{h_a \times \text{id}_{U_b}} & (Y \times_{g, U, \varphi_a} U_a) \times_{\varphi_a \circ \pi_{U_a}, U, \varphi_b} U_b \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ X \times_{f, U, \pi_U} (U_a \times_{\varphi_a, U, \varphi_b} U_b) & & Y \times_{g, U, \pi_U} (U_a \times_{\varphi_a, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ (X \times_{f, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \times_{\varphi_b \circ \pi_{U_b}, U, \varphi_a} U_a & \xrightarrow{h_b \times \text{id}_{U_a}} & (Y \times_{g, U, \varphi_b} U_b) \times_{\varphi_b \circ \pi_{U_b}, U, \varphi_a} U_a, \end{array}$$

then there exists a unique $h : X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $h_a = h \times \text{id}_{U_a}$ for all $a \in A$.

Then [3, Prop.s A.12, A.13 & §A.6] show that descent holds for objects and morphisms for affine schemes with the fppf topology, but for arbitrary schemes with the fppf topology, descent holds for morphisms and fails for objects.

7.4 Properties of 1-morphisms

Objects V in $\mathcal{C}$ yield stacks $\bar{V}$ on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$.

Definition 7.10. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site, and V an object of $\mathcal{C}$. Define a category $\bar{V}$ to have objects (U, θ) where $U \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\theta : U \rightarrow V$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$, and to have morphisms $\psi : (U_1, \theta_1) \rightarrow (U_2, \theta_2)$ where $\psi : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\theta_2 \circ \psi = \theta_1 : U_1 \rightarrow V$. Define a functor $p_{\bar{V}} : \bar{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by $p_{\bar{V}} : (U, \theta) \mapsto U$ and $p_{\bar{V}} : \psi \mapsto \psi$. Note that $p_{\bar{V}}$ is *injective on morphisms*. It is then automatic that $p_{\bar{V}} : \bar{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a category fibred in groupoids, since in (43) we can take $g = g'$. It is also automatic that $p_{\bar{V}} : \bar{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a prestack, since in (44) we must have $X_a = Y_a = (U_a, \theta_a)$, $x_a = y_a = \varphi_a$, $X = Y = (U, \theta)$, etc., and the unique solution for f is $f = \text{id}_U$.

The site $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is called *subcanonical* if $\bar{V}$ is a stack for all objects $V \in \mathcal{C}$. If descent for morphisms holds for $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is subcanonical. Most interesting sites are subcanonical. Suppose $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is a subcanonical site. If $f : V \rightarrow W$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$, define a 1-morphism $\bar{f} : \bar{V} \rightarrow \bar{W}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ by $\bar{f} : (U, \theta) \mapsto (U, f \circ \theta)$ and $\bar{f} : \psi \mapsto \psi$. Then the (2-)functor $V \mapsto \bar{V}$, $f \mapsto \bar{f}$ embeds $\mathcal{C}$ as a full discrete 2-subcategory of $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$.

Definition 7.11. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a subcanonical site. A stack $\mathcal{X}$ over $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is called *representable* if it is equivalent in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ to a stack of the form $\bar{V}$ for some $V \in \mathcal{C}$. A 1-morphism $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ is called *representable* if for all $V \in \mathcal{C}$ and all 1-morphisms $G : \bar{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, the fibre product $\mathcal{X} \times_{F, \mathcal{Y}, G} \bar{V}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ is a representable stack.

Remark 7.12. For stacks in algebraic geometry, one often takes a different definition of representable objects and 1-morphisms: $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is a category of schemes with the étale topology, but stacks are called representable if they are equivalent to an *algebraic space* rather than a scheme. This is because schemes are not general enough for some purposes, e.g. the quotient of a scheme by an étale equivalence relation may be an algebraic space but not a scheme.

In our situation, we will have no need to enlarge C^∞ -schemes to some category of ‘ C^∞ -algebraic spaces’, as C^∞ -schemes are already general enough, e.g. the quotient of a locally fair C^∞ -scheme by an étale equivalence relation is a locally fair C^∞ -scheme. This is because the natural topology on C^∞ -schemes is much finer than the Zariski or étale topology on schemes, for instance, affine C^∞ -schemes are always Hausdorff.

Definition 7.13. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a subcanonical site. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a property of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$. (For instance, if $\mathcal{C}$ is the category $\mathbf{Top}$ of topological spaces, then $\mathbf{P}$ could be ‘proper’, ‘open’, ‘surjective’, ‘covering map’, ...). We say that $\mathbf{P}$ is *invariant under base change* if for all Cartesian squares in $\mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & Y \\ \downarrow e & & \downarrow h \\ X & \xrightarrow{\quad g \quad} & Z, \end{array}$$

if g is $\mathbf{P}$, then f is $\mathbf{P}$. We say that $\mathbf{P}$ is *local on the target* if whenever $f : U \rightarrow V$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\{\varphi_a : V_a \rightarrow V\}_{a \in A}$ is a covering in $\mathcal{J}$ such that $\pi_{V_a} : U \times_{f, V, \varphi_a} V_a \rightarrow V_a$ is $\mathbf{P}$ for all $a \in A$, then f is $\mathbf{P}$.

Let $\mathbf{P}$ be invariant under base change and local in the target, and let $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a representable 1-morphism in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$. If $W \in \mathcal{C}$ and $G : \bar{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a 1-morphism then $\mathcal{X} \times_{F, \mathcal{Y}, G} \bar{W}$ is equivalent to $\bar{V}$ for some $V \in \mathcal{C}$, and under this equivalence the 1-morphism $\pi_{\bar{W}} : \mathcal{X} \times_{F, \mathcal{Y}, G} \bar{W} \rightarrow \bar{W}$ is 2-isomorphic to $\bar{f} : \bar{V} \rightarrow \bar{W}$ for some unique morphism $f : V \rightarrow W$ in $\mathcal{C}$. We say that F *has property $\mathbf{P}$* if for all $W \in \mathcal{C}$ and 1-morphisms $G : \bar{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, the morphism $f : V \rightarrow W$ in $\mathcal{C}$ corresponding to $\pi_{\bar{W}} : \mathcal{X} \times_{F, \mathcal{Y}, G} \bar{W} \rightarrow \bar{W}$ has property $\mathbf{P}$.

We define *surjective* 1-morphisms without requiring them representable.

Definition 7.14. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site, and $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a 1-morphism in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$. We call F *surjective* if whenever $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $p_{\mathcal{Y}}(Y) = U \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists a covering $\{\varphi_a : U_a \rightarrow U\}_{a \in A}$ in $\mathcal{J}$ such that for all $a \in A$ there exists $X_a \in \mathcal{X}$ with $p_{\mathcal{X}}(X_a) = U_a$ and a morphism $g_a : F(X_a) \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{Y}$ with $p_{\mathcal{Y}}(g_a) = \varphi_a$.

Following [24, Prop. 3.8.1, Lem. 4.3.3 & Rem. 4.14.1], [34, §6], we may prove:

Proposition 7.15. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a subcanonical site, and*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{Y} \\ e \downarrow & \begin{array}{c} f \nearrow \\ \eta \nearrow \\ g \nearrow \end{array} & \downarrow h \\ \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{Z} \end{array} \quad (47)$$

be a 2-Cartesian square in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a property of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ which is invariant under base change and local in the target. Then:

- (a) *If h is representable, then e is representable. If also h is $\mathbf{P}$, then e is $\mathbf{P}$.*
- (b) *If g is surjective, then f is surjective.*

Now suppose also that $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ has descent for objects and morphisms, and that g (and hence f) is surjective. Then:

- (c) *If e is surjective then h is surjective, and if e is representable, then h is representable, and if also e is $\mathbf{P}$, then h is $\mathbf{P}$.*

7.5 Geometric stacks, and stacks associated to groupoids

The 2-category $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ of all stacks over a site $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is usually too general to do geometry with. To obtain a smaller 2-category whose objects have better properties, we impose extra conditions on a stack $\mathcal{X}$:

Definition 7.16. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site. We call a stack $\mathcal{X}$ on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ *geometric* if the diagonal 1-morphism $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is representable, and there exists $U \in \mathcal{C}$ and a surjective 1-morphism $\Pi : \bar{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, which we call an *atlas* for $\mathcal{X}$. Write $\mathbf{GSta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ for the full 2-subcategory of geometric stacks in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$. Here $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ representable is equivalent to Π representable, as Π is surjective.

To obtain nice classes of stacks, one usually requires further properties $\mathbf{P}$ of $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ and Π . For example, in algebraic geometry with $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ schemes with the étale topology, we assume $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is quasicompact and separated, and Π is étale for Deligne–Mumford stacks $\mathcal{X}$, and Π is smooth for Artin stacks $\mathcal{X}$.

The following material is based on Metzler [28, §3.1 & §3.3], Laumon and Moret-Bailly [24, §§2.4.3, 3.4.3, 3.8, 4.3], and Lerman [25, §4.4].

We can characterize geometric stacks $\mathcal{X}$ up to equivalence solely in terms of objects and morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$, using the idea of *groupoid objects* in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 7.17. A *groupoid object* (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) in a category $\mathcal{C}$, or simply *groupoid* in $\mathcal{C}$, consists of objects U, V in $\mathcal{C}$ and morphisms $s, t : V \rightarrow U$, $u : U \rightarrow V$, $i : V \rightarrow V$ and $m : V \times_{s, U, t} V \rightarrow V$ satisfying the identities

$$\begin{aligned} s \circ u &= t \circ u = \text{id}_U, \quad s \circ i = t, \quad t \circ i = s, \quad s \circ m = s \circ \pi_2, \quad t \circ m = t \circ \pi_1, \\ m \circ (i \times \text{id}_V) &= u \circ s, \quad m \circ (\text{id}_V \times i) = u \circ t, \\ m \circ (m \times \text{id}_V) &= m \circ (\text{id}_V \times m) : V \times_U V \times_U V \longrightarrow V, \\ m \circ (\text{id}_V \times u) &= m \circ (u \times \text{id}_V) : V = V \times_U U \longrightarrow V, \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where we suppose all the fibre products exist.

Groupoids in $\mathcal{C}$ are so called because a groupoid in **Sets** is a groupoid in the usual sense, that is, a category with invertible morphisms, where U is the set of *objects*, V the set of *morphisms*, $s : V \rightarrow U$ the *source* of a morphism, $t : V \rightarrow U$ the *target* of a morphism, $u : U \rightarrow V$ the *unit* taking $X \mapsto \text{id}_X$, i the *inverse* taking $f \mapsto f^{-1}$, and m the *multiplication* taking $(f, g) \mapsto f \circ g$ when $s(f) = t(g)$. Then (48) reduces to the usual axioms for a groupoid.

From a geometric stack with an atlas, we can construct a groupoid in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 7.18. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a subcanonical site, and suppose $\mathcal{X}$ is a geometric stack on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ with atlas $\Pi : \bar{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Then $\bar{U} \times_{\Pi, \mathcal{X}, \Pi} \bar{U}$ is equivalent to $\bar{V}$ for some $V \in \mathcal{C}$ as Π is representable. Hence we can take $\bar{V}$ to be the fibre product, and we have a 2-Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{V} & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{t} \quad} & \bar{U} \\ \bar{s} \downarrow & \eta \nearrow & \downarrow \Pi \\ \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad \Pi \quad} & \mathcal{X} \end{array} \tag{49}$$

in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$. Here as $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is subcanonical, any 1-morphism $\bar{V} \rightarrow \bar{U}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ is 2-isomorphic to $\bar{f}$ for some unique morphism $f : V \rightarrow U$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Thus we may write the projections in (49) as $\bar{s}, \bar{t}$ for some unique $s, t : V \rightarrow U$ in $\mathcal{C}$.

By the universal property of fibre products there exists a 1-morphism $H : \bar{U} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ unique up to 2-isomorphism with $\bar{s} \circ H \cong \text{id}_{\bar{U}} \cong \bar{t} \circ H$. This H is 2-isomorphic to $\bar{u} : \bar{U} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ for some unique morphism $u : U \rightarrow V$ in $\mathcal{C}$, and then $s \circ u = t \circ u = \text{id}_U$. Similarly, exchanging the two factors of U in the fibre product we obtain a unique morphism $i : V \rightarrow V$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $s \circ i = t$ and $t \circ i = s$. In $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ we have equivalences

$$\overline{V \times_{s, U, t} V} \simeq \bar{V} \times_{\bar{s}, \bar{U}, \bar{t}} \bar{V} \simeq (\bar{U} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{U}) \times_{\bar{U}} (\bar{U} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{U}) \simeq \bar{U} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{U} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{U}.$$

Let $m : V \times_{s,U,t} V \rightarrow V$ be the unique morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\bar{m}$ is 2-isomorphic to the projection $\overline{V \times_{s,U,t} V} \rightarrow \bar{V} = \bar{U} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{U}$ corresponding to projection to the first and third factors of $\bar{U}$ in the final fibre product. It is now not difficult to verify that (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) is a groupoid in $\mathcal{C}$.

Conversely, given a groupoid in $\mathcal{C}$ we can construct a stack $\mathcal{X}$.

Definition 7.19. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site with descent for morphisms, and (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) be a groupoid in $\mathcal{C}$. Define a prestack $\mathcal{X}'$ on $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ as follows: let $\mathcal{X}'$ be the category whose objects are pairs (T, f) where $f : T \rightarrow U$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$, and morphisms are $(p, q) : (T_1, f_1) \rightarrow (T_2, f_2)$ where $p : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ and $q : T_1 \rightarrow V$ are morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ with $f_1 = s \circ q$ and $f_2 \circ p = t \circ q$. Given morphisms $(p_1, q_1) : (T_1, f_1) \rightarrow (T_2, f_2)$ and $(p_2, q_2) : (T_2, f_2) \rightarrow (T_3, f_3)$ the composition is $(p_2, q_2) \circ (p_1, q_1) = (p_2 \circ p_1, m \circ (q_1 \times (q_2 \circ p_2)))$, where $q_1 \times (q_2 \circ p_2) : T_1 \rightarrow V \times_{t,U,s} V$ is induced by the morphisms $q_1 : T_1 \rightarrow V$ and $q_2 \circ p_2 : T_1 \rightarrow V$, which satisfy $t \circ q_1 = f_2 \circ p_1 = s \circ (q_2 \circ p_2)$.

Define a functor $p_{\mathcal{X}'} : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by $p_{\mathcal{X}'} : (T, f) \mapsto T$ and $p_{\mathcal{X}'} : (p, q) \mapsto p$. Using the groupoid axioms (48) we can show that $p_{\mathcal{X}'} : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a category fibred in groupoids. Since $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ has descent for morphisms, we can also show $\mathcal{X}'$ is a prestack. But in general it is not a stack. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the associated stack from Proposition 7.6. We call $\mathcal{X}$ the *stack associated to the groupoid* (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) . It fits into a natural 2-commutative diagram (49).

Groupoids in $\mathcal{C}$ are often written $V \rightrightarrows U$, to emphasize $s, t : V \rightarrow U$, leaving u, i, m implicit. The associated stack is then written as $[V \rightrightarrows U]$.

Our next theorem is proved by Metzler [28, Prop. 70] when $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is the site of topological spaces with open covers, but examining the proof shows that all he uses about $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is that fibre products exist in $\mathcal{C}$ and $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ has descent for objects and morphisms. See also Lerman [25, Prop. 4.31]. If fibre products may not exist in $\mathcal{C}$ then one must also require the morphisms s, t in (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) to be *representable* in $\mathcal{C}$, that is, for all $f : T \rightarrow U$ in $\mathcal{C}$ the fibre products $T_{f,U,s}V$ and $T_{f,U,t}V$ exist in $\mathcal{C}$.

Theorem 7.20. *Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ be a site, and suppose that all fibre products exist in $\mathcal{C}$, and that descent for objects and morphisms holds in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$. Then the constructions of Definitions 7.18 and 7.19 are inverse. That is, if (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) is a groupoid in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is the associated stack, then $\mathcal{X}$ is a geometric stack, and the 2-commutative diagram (49) is 2-Cartesian, and Π in (49) is surjective and so an atlas for $\mathcal{X}$, and (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) is canonically isomorphic to the groupoid constructed in Definition 7.18 from the atlas $\Pi : \bar{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Conversely, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a geometric stack with atlas $\Pi : \bar{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) is the groupoid in $\mathcal{C}$ constructed from Π in Definition 7.18, and $\mathcal{X}$ is the stack associated to (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) in Definition 7.19, then $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$. Thus every geometric stack is equivalent to a groupoid stack.*

In the situation of Theorem 7.20 we have 2-Cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{V} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bar{U} \\
\bar{s} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \Pi \\
\bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X},
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{V} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \\
\bar{s} \times \bar{t} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \\
\bar{U} \times \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X},
\end{array}
\quad (50)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{V} \times_{\bar{s} \times \bar{t}, \bar{U} \times \bar{U}, \Delta_{\bar{U}}} \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I_{\mathcal{X}} \\
\pi_{\bar{U}} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \iota_{\mathcal{X}} \\
\bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X},
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \\
\bar{u} \times \text{id}_{\bar{U}} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow j_{\mathcal{X}} \\
\bar{V} \times_{\bar{s} \times \bar{t}, \bar{U} \times \bar{U}, \Delta_{\bar{U}}} \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I_{\mathcal{X}},
\end{array}$$

with surjective rows. So from Proposition 7.15 we deduce:

Corollary 7.21. *In the situation of Theorem 7.20, let $\mathbf{P}$ be a property of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ which is invariant under base change and local in the target. Then $\bar{\Pi} : \bar{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if $s : V \rightarrow U$ is $\mathbf{P}$, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if $s \times t : V \rightarrow U \times U$ is $\mathbf{P}$, and $\iota_{\mathcal{X}} : I_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if $\pi_U : V \times_{s \times t, U \times U, \Delta_U} U \rightarrow U$ is $\mathbf{P}$, and $j_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow I_{\mathcal{X}}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if $u \times \text{id}_U : U \rightarrow V \times_{s \times t, U \times U, \Delta_U} U$ is $\mathbf{P}$.*

We can describe atlases for fibre products of geometric stacks.

Example 7.22. Suppose $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is a subcanonical site, and all fibre products exist in $\mathcal{C}$. Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{Y} \\
e \downarrow & \eta \nearrow & \downarrow h \\
\mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{Z}
\end{array}
\quad (51)$$

be a 2-Cartesian diagram in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$, where $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ are geometric stacks. Let $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}} : \bar{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}} : \bar{U}_{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be atlases. As $\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is representable the fibre product $\bar{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \times_{g \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{Z}, h \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}} \bar{U}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is represented by an object $U_{\mathcal{W}}$ of $\mathcal{C}$. Then we have a 2-commutative diagram, where we omit 2-morphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \bar{U}_{\mathcal{W}} := \bar{U}_{\mathcal{X}} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \bar{U}_{\mathcal{Y}} & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \bar{U}_{\mathcal{Y}} \\
& \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \searrow \\
\bar{U}_{\mathcal{X}} & \xrightarrow{\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}} & \mathcal{X} & \xleftarrow{e} & \mathcal{W} \\
& \searrow & \swarrow & \swarrow & \searrow \\
& & \mathcal{Z} & \xleftarrow{h} & \mathcal{Y}
\end{array}
\quad (52)$$

Here the five squares in (52) are 2-Cartesian, although the triangles are not. Define $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}} = \pi_2 \circ \pi_1 : \bar{U}_{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, where π_1, π_2 are as in (52). Proposition 7.15(a),(b) imply that π_1, π_2 are representable and surjective, since $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}$ are. Hence $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}} = \pi_2 \circ \pi_1$ is also representable and surjective, so $\mathcal{W}$ is a *geometric stack*, and $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ is an *atlas* for $\mathcal{W}$. In the same way, if $\mathbf{P}$ is a property of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ which is invariant under base change and local in the target and closed under compositions, and $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}}$ are $\mathbf{P}$, then $\Pi_{\mathcal{W}}$ is $\mathbf{P}$.

Now let $\bar{V}_{\mathcal{W}} = \bar{U}_{\mathcal{W}} \times_{\mathcal{W}} \bar{U}_{\mathcal{W}}$ and complete to a groupoid $(U_{\mathcal{W}}, V_{\mathcal{W}}, s_{\mathcal{W}}, t_{\mathcal{W}}, u_{\mathcal{W}}, i_{\mathcal{W}}, m_{\mathcal{W}})$ in $\mathcal{C}$ as above, with $\mathcal{W} \simeq [V_{\mathcal{W}} \rightrightarrows U_{\mathcal{W}}]$, and do the same for $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$.

Then by a diagram chase similar to (52) we can show that

$$\bar{V}_W \cong \bar{V}_X \times_Z \bar{V}_Y \quad \text{and} \quad V_W \cong (U_W \times_{U_X} V_X) \times_{U_Y} V_Y. \quad (53)$$

Corollary 7.23. *Suppose $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})$ is a subcanonical site, and all fibre products exist in $\mathcal{C}$. Then the 2-subcategory $\mathbf{GSta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$ of geometric stacks is closed under fibre products in $\mathbf{Sta}_{(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{J})}$.*

8 C^∞ -stacks and orbifolds

We now discuss C^∞ -stacks, that is, geometric stacks over the site $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ of C^∞ -schemes with the open cover topology. The author knows of no previous work on these. We assume the background material of §7. Our principal interest is in *Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks*, which are C^∞ -stacks locally modelled on quotients $[\underline{U}/G]$ for $\underline{U}$ an affine C^∞ -scheme and G a finite group. As we explain in §8.8, *orbifolds* (which may be without boundary, or with boundary, or with corners) may be defined as a 2-subcategory of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks. The author found Metzler [28] and Noohi [34] useful in writing this section.

8.1 C^∞ -stacks

Definition 8.1. Define a Grothendieck topology $\mathcal{J}$ on the category $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ of C^∞ -schemes to have coverings $\{i_a : \underline{U}_a \rightarrow \underline{U}\}_{a \in A}$ where $V_a = i_a(U_a)$ is open in U with $i_a : \underline{U}_a \rightarrow (V_a, \mathcal{O}_U|_{V_a})$ and isomorphism for all $a \in A$, and $U = \bigcup_{a \in A} V_a$. Using Proposition 4.25 we see that up to isomorphisms of the $\underline{U}_a$, the coverings $\{i_a : \underline{U}_a \rightarrow \underline{U}\}_{a \in A}$ of $\underline{U}$ correspond exactly to open covers $\{V_a : a \in A\}$ of U .

It is a straightforward exercise in sheaf theory to prove:

Proposition 8.2. *The site $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ has descent for objects and morphisms. Thus it is subcanonical.*

The point here is that since coverings of $\underline{U}$ in $\mathcal{J}$ are just open covers of the underlying topological space U , rather than something more complicated like étale covers in algebraic geometry, proving descent is easy: for objects, we glue the topological spaces X_a of $\underline{X}_a$ together in the usual way to get a topological space X , then we glue the $\mathcal{O}_{X_a}$ together to get a presheaf of C^∞ -rings $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_X$ on X isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{X_a}$ on $X_a \subseteq X$ for all $a \in A$, and finally we sheafify $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_X$ to a sheaf of C^∞ -rings $\mathcal{O}_X$ on X , which is still isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{X_a}$ on $X_a \subseteq X$.

Definition 8.3. A C^∞ -stack is a geometric stack on the site $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$. Write $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ for the 2-category of C^∞ -stacks, $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta} = \mathbf{GSta}_{(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})}$. If $\underline{X}$ is a C^∞ -scheme then $\bar{\underline{X}}$ is a C^∞ -stack. Write $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ for the full 2-subcategories of C^∞ -stacks $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ which are equivalent to $\bar{\underline{X}}$ for $\underline{X}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}$ or $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, respectively.

Since $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ is a subcanonical site, the embedding $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ taking $\underline{X} \mapsto \underline{\bar{X}}, \underline{f} \mapsto \underline{\bar{f}}$ is fully faithful. Hence $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are equivalent to $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, considered as 2-categories with only identity 2-morphisms. In practice one usually does not distinguish between schemes and stacks which are equivalent to schemes, that is, one identifies $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lfp}}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$.

Remark 8.4. Behrend and Xu [4, Def. 2.15] use ‘ C^∞ -stack’ to mean something different, a geometric stack over the site $(\mathbf{Man}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}})$ of manifolds without boundary with Grothendieck topology $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}}$ given by open covers. These are also called ‘smooth stacks’ or ‘differentiable stacks’ in [4, 18, 28, 34]. We will write $\mathbf{ManSta}$ for the 2-category of geometric stacks on $(\mathbf{Man}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}})$.

The full and faithful embedding $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ has $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}} = (F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}})^*(\mathcal{J})$, as both $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}}$ are defined by open covers. Therefore there is a natural truncation 2-functor $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{ManSta}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta} \rightarrow \mathbf{ManSta}$, given on objects by $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{ManSta}} : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X} \times_{p_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}} \mathbf{Man}$. See for example Metzler [28, Ex. 43, Lem. 44] on relating stacks on different sites.

A stack $\mathcal{X}$ on $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ encodes all morphisms $F : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ for C^∞ -schemes $\underline{U}$, whereas its image $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{ManSta}}(\mathcal{X})$ remembers only morphisms $F : U \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ for manifolds U . Thus the truncation functor $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{ManSta}}$ *loses information*, as it forgets morphisms from C^∞ -schemes which are not manifolds.

This includes any information about *nonreduced* C^∞ -schemes, and the nilpotent parts of C^∞ -rings. So, for example, the point $\text{Spec } \mathbb{R}$ and the double point $\text{Spec}(C^\infty(\mathbb{R})/(x^2))$ are different in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, but both are taken to the point in $\mathbf{ManSta}$. For the applications in [22] we need this nonreduced information, so it is not enough to work with stacks on $(\mathbf{Man}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}})$.

Theorems 4.26 and 7.20, Corollary 7.23 and Proposition 8.2 imply:

Theorem 8.5. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to a groupoid stack $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$, where $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ is a groupoid in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$. Conversely, any groupoid in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ defines a C^∞ -stack $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$. All fibre products exist in the 2-category $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$.*

Quotient stacks $[\underline{U}/\underline{G}]$ are a special class of groupoid stacks $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$.

Definition 8.6. A C^∞ -group $\underline{G}$ is a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{G} = (G, \mathcal{O}_G)$ equipped with an identity element $1 \in G$ and multiplication and inverse morphisms $\underline{m} : \underline{G} \times \underline{G} \rightarrow \underline{G}$, $\underline{i} : \underline{G} \rightarrow \underline{G}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ such that $(\underline{*}, \underline{G}, \underline{\pi}, \underline{\pi}, 1, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ is a groupoid object in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$. Here $\underline{*} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{R}$ is a single point, and $\underline{\pi} : \underline{G} \rightarrow \underline{*}$ is the unique morphism, and we regard $1 \in G$ as a morphism $1 : \underline{*} \rightarrow \underline{G}$.

Let $\underline{G}$ be a C^∞ -group, and $\underline{U}$ a C^∞ -scheme. A (left) *action* of $\underline{G}$ on $\underline{U}$ is a morphism $\underline{\mu} : \underline{G} \times \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{U}$ such that

$$(\underline{U}, \underline{G} \times \underline{U}, \underline{\pi}_U, \underline{\mu}, 1 \times \underline{\text{id}}_U, (\underline{i} \circ \underline{\pi}_G) \times \underline{\mu}, (\underline{m} \circ ((\underline{\pi}_G \circ \underline{\pi}_1) \times (\underline{\pi}_G \circ \underline{\pi}_2))) \times (\underline{\pi}_U \circ \underline{\pi}_2)) \quad (54)$$

is a groupoid object in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, where in the final morphism $\underline{\pi}_1, \underline{\pi}_2$ are the projections from $(\underline{G} \times \underline{U}) \times_{\underline{\pi}_U, \underline{U}, \underline{\mu}} (\underline{G} \times \underline{U})$ to the first and second factors $\underline{G} \times \underline{U}$.

Then define the *quotient stack* $[\underline{U}/\underline{G}]$ to be the groupoid stack $[\underline{G} \times \underline{U} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ for the groupoid (54). It is a C^∞ -stack.

If $\underline{G} = (G, \mathcal{O}_G)$ is a C^∞ -group then the underlying space G is a topological group, and is in particular a group, and if $\underline{G} = (G, \mathcal{O}_G)$ acts on $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$ then G acts continuously on U .

If G is a Lie group then $\underline{G} = F_{\text{Man}}^{\text{C}^\infty \text{Sch}}(G)$ is a C^∞ -group in a natural way, by applying $F_{\text{Man}}^{\text{C}^\infty \text{Sch}}$ to the smooth multiplication and inverse maps $m : G \times G \rightarrow G$ and $i : G \rightarrow G$. If a Lie group G acts smoothly on a manifold U with action $\mu : G \times U \rightarrow U$ then the C^∞ -group $\underline{G} = F_{\text{Man}}^{\text{C}^\infty \text{Sch}}(G)$ acts on the C^∞ -scheme $\underline{U} = F_{\text{Man}}^{\text{C}^\infty \text{Sch}}(U)$ with action $\underline{\mu} = F_{\text{Man}}^{\text{C}^\infty \text{Sch}}(\mu) : \underline{G} \times \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{U}$, so we can form the quotient C^∞ -stack $[\underline{U}/\underline{G}]$.

In particular, any finite group G may be regarded as a Lie group of dimension 0, with the discrete topology, so it has an associated C^∞ -group, which we will write as G rather than $\underline{G}$. Then an action of G as a C^∞ -group on a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{U}$ is equivalent to an action of G on $\underline{U}$ as a finite group by isomorphisms.

8.2 Properties of morphisms of C^∞ -stacks

We define some classes of morphisms of C^∞ -schemes.

Definition 8.7. Let $\underline{f} = (f, f^\#) : \underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \underline{Y} = (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ be a morphism in $\text{C}^\infty \text{Sch}$. Then:

- We call $\underline{f}$ an *open embedding* if $V = f(X)$ is an open subset in Y and $(f, f^\#) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (V, \mathcal{O}_Y|_V)$ is an isomorphism.
- We call $\underline{f}$ a *closed embedding* if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a homeomorphism with a closed subset of $\underline{Y}$, and the morphism of sheaves of C^∞ -rings $f^\# : \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow f_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is surjective. Equivalently, $\underline{f}$ is an isomorphism with a closed C^∞ -subscheme of $\underline{Y}$. Over affine open subsets $\underline{U} \cong \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ in $\underline{Y}$, $\underline{f}$ is modelled on the natural morphism $\text{Spec}(\mathfrak{C}/I) \hookrightarrow \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ for some ideal I in $\mathfrak{C}$.
- We call $\underline{f}$ an *embedding* if we may write $\underline{f} = \underline{g} \circ \underline{h}$ where $\underline{h}$ is an open embedding and $\underline{g}$ is a closed embedding.
- We call $\underline{f}$ *étale* if each $x \in X$ has an open neighbourhood U in X such that $V = f(U)$ is open in Y and $(f|_U, f^\#|_U) : (U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U) \rightarrow (V, \mathcal{O}_Y|_V)$ is an isomorphism. That is, $\underline{f}$ is a local isomorphism.
- We call $\underline{f}$ *proper* if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a proper map of topological spaces, that is, if $S \subseteq Y$ is compact then $f^{-1}(S) \subseteq X$ is compact.
- We say that $\underline{f}$ *has finite fibres* if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a finite map, that is, $f^{-1}(y)$ is a finite subset of X for all $y \in Y$.
- We call $\underline{f}$ *separated* if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a separated map of topological spaces, that is, $\Delta_X = \{(x, x) : x \in X\}$ is a closed subset of the topological fibre product $X \times_{f, Y, f} X = \{(x, x') \in X \times X : f(x) = f(x')\}$.
- We call $\underline{f}$ *closed* if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a closed map of topological spaces, that is, $S \subseteq X$ closed implies $f(S) \subseteq Y$ closed.

- We call $\underline{f}$ *universally closed* if whenever $\underline{g} : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is a morphism then $\pi_{\underline{W}} : \underline{X} \times_{\underline{f}, \underline{Y}, \underline{g}} \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{W}$ is closed.
- We call $\underline{f}$ a *submersion* if for all $x \in X$ with $f(x) = y$, there exists an open neighbourhood U of y in Y and a morphism $\underline{g} = (g, g^\#) : (U, \mathcal{O}_Y|_U) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ with $g(y) = x$ and $\underline{f} \circ \underline{g} = \text{id}_{(U, \mathcal{O}_Y|_U)}$.
- We call $\underline{f}$ *locally fair*, or *locally good*, or *locally finitely presented*, if whenever $\underline{U}$ is a locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented C^∞ -scheme, respectively, and $\underline{g} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is a morphism then $\underline{X} \times_{\underline{f}, \underline{Y}, \underline{g}} \underline{U}$ is locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented, respectively.

Remark 8.8. These are mostly analogues of standard concepts in algebraic geometry, as in Hartshorne [17] for instance. But because the topology on C^∞ -schemes is finer than the Zariski topology in algebraic geometry — for instance, affine C^∞ -schemes are Hausdorff — our definitions of étale and proper are simpler than in algebraic geometry. (Open or closed) embeddings correspond to (open or closed) immersions in algebraic geometry, but we prefer the word ‘embedding’, as immersion has a different meaning in differential geometry. Closed morphisms are not invariant under base change, which is why we define universally closed. If X, Y are manifolds and $\underline{X}, \underline{Y} = F_{\text{Man}^c}^{C^\infty \text{Sch}}(X, Y)$, then $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is a submersion of C^∞ -schemes if and only if $\underline{f} = F_{\text{Man}^c}^{C^\infty \text{Sch}}(f)$ for $f : X \rightarrow Y$ a submersion of manifolds.

Definition 8.9. Let P be a property of morphisms in $C^\infty \text{Sch}$. We say that P is *stable under open embedding* if whenever $\underline{f} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ is P and $\underline{i} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{W}$ is an open embedding, then $\underline{i} \circ \underline{f} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{W}$ is P .

The next proposition is elementary. See Laumon and Bailly [24, §3.10] and Noohi [34, Ex. 4.6] for similar lists for the étale and topological sites.

Proposition 8.10. *The following properties of morphisms in $C^\infty \text{Sch}$ are invariant under base change and local in the target in the site $(C^\infty \text{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$: open embedding, closed embedding, embedding, étale, proper, has finite fibres, separated, universally closed, submersion, locally fair, locally good, locally finitely presented. The following properties are also stable under open embedding: open embedding, embedding, étale, has finite fibres, separated, submersion, locally fair, locally good, locally finitely presented.*

As in §7.4, this implies that these properties are also defined for representable morphisms in $C^\infty \text{Sta}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a C^∞ -stack then $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is representable, and if $\Pi : \underline{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an atlas then Π is representable, so we can require that $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ or Π has some of these properties.

Definition 8.11. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack. Following [24, Def. 7.6], we say that $\mathcal{X}$ is *separated* if the diagonal 1-morphism $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is universally closed. If $\mathcal{X} = \underline{X}$ for some C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ then $\mathcal{X}$ is separated if and only if $\Delta_X : X \rightarrow X \times X$ is closed, that is, if and only if X is Hausdorff.

Proposition 8.12. *Let $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \times_{f, \mathcal{Z}, g} \mathcal{Y}$ be a fibre product of C^∞ -stacks with $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ separated. Then $\mathcal{W}$ is separated.*

Proof. We have a 2-commutative diagram with both squares 2-Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W} & \\
 & \searrow & \Delta_{\mathcal{W}} & \nearrow \pi_2 & \\
 \mathcal{Z} & & \mathcal{X} \times_{f \circ \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z}, g \circ \mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Y} & & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}. \\
 & \searrow j_{\mathcal{Z}} & \swarrow & \searrow \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \times \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}} & \\
 & I_{\mathcal{Z}} & & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} &
 \end{array} \quad (55)$$

Let $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ be a groupoid presentation of $\mathcal{Z}$, and consider the fourth 2-Cartesian diagram of (50), with surjective rows. The left hand morphism $\underline{u} \times \underline{id}_{\underline{U}}$ has a left inverse $\pi_{\underline{U}}$, and so is automatically universally closed. Hence $j_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is universally closed by Propositions 7.15(c) and 8.10, so π_1 in (55) is universally closed by Propositions 7.15(a) and 8.10. Also $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}, \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}$ are universally closed as $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ are separated, so $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \times \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}}$ in (55) is universally closed, and π_2 is universally closed. Hence $\Delta_{\mathcal{W}} \cong \pi_2 \circ \pi_1$ is universally closed, and $\mathcal{W}$ is separated. $\square$

8.3 Open C^∞ -substacks and open covers

Definition 8.13. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack. A C^∞ -substack $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\mathcal{X}$ is a substack of $\mathcal{X}$, in the sense of Definition 7.4, which is also a C^∞ -stack. It has a natural inclusion 1-morphism $i_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$. We call $\mathcal{Y}$ an *open C^∞ -substack* of $\mathcal{X}$ if $i_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is a representable open embedding, a *closed C^∞ -substack* of $\mathcal{X}$ if $i_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is a representable closed embedding, and a *locally closed C^∞ -substack* of $\mathcal{X}$ if $i_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is a representable embedding. An *open cover* $\{\mathcal{Y}_a : a \in A\}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is a family of open C^∞ -substacks $\mathcal{Y}_a$ in $\mathcal{X}$ with $\coprod_{a \in A} i_{\mathcal{Y}_a} : \coprod_{a \in A} \mathcal{Y}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ surjective.

Some properties of $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}, \iota_{\mathcal{X}}, j_{\mathcal{X}}$ and atlases for $\mathcal{X}$ can be tested on the elements of an open cover. The proof is elementary.

Proposition 8.14. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack, and $\{\mathcal{Y}_a : a \in A\}$ an open cover of $\mathcal{X}$. Suppose $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ are properties of morphisms in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ which are invariant under base change and local in the target in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$, and that $\mathbf{P}$ is stable under open embedding. Then:*

- (a) *Let $\Pi_a : \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a$ be an atlas for $\mathcal{Y}_a$ for $a \in A$. Set $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = \coprod_{a \in A} \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a$ and $\Pi = \coprod_{a \in A} i_{\mathcal{Y}_a} \circ \Pi_a : \bar{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Then Π is an atlas for $\mathcal{X}$, and Π is $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if Π_a is $\mathbf{P}$ for all $a \in A$.*
- (b) *$\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if $\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_a} : \mathcal{Y}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a \times \mathcal{Y}_a$ is $\mathbf{P}$ for all $a \in A$.*
- (c) *$\iota_{\mathcal{X}} : I_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is $\mathbf{Q}$ if and only if $\iota_{\mathcal{Y}_a} : I_{\mathcal{Y}_a} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a$ is $\mathbf{Q}$ for all $a \in A$.*
- (d) *$j_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow I_{\mathcal{X}}$ is $\mathbf{Q}$ if and only if $j_{\mathcal{Y}_a} : \mathcal{Y}_a \rightarrow I_{\mathcal{Y}_a}$ is $\mathbf{Q}$ for all $a \in A$.*

If $\mathcal{X} = \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ for some C^∞ -scheme $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = (U, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}})$, then the open C^∞ -substacks of $\mathcal{X}$ are $(\bar{V}, \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}|_{\bar{V}}})$ for all $V \subseteq U$, that is, they are the images in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ of the open C^∞ -subschemes of U . We can also describe the open substacks of groupoid stacks $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$:

Proposition 8.15. *Let $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ be a groupoid in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ and $\mathcal{X} = [\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ the associated C^∞ -stack, and write $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$, and so on. Then open C^∞ -substacks $\mathcal{X}'$ of $\mathcal{X}$ are naturally in 1-1 correspondence with open subsets $U' \subseteq U$ with $s^{-1}(U') = t^{-1}(U')$, where $\mathcal{X}' = [\underline{V}' \rightrightarrows \underline{U}']$ for $\underline{U}' = (U', \mathcal{O}_U|_{U'})$ and $\underline{V}' = (s^{-1}(U'), \mathcal{O}_V|_{s^{-1}(U')})$. If $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ is as in (54), so that $\mathcal{X}$ is a quotient stack $[\underline{U}/\underline{G}]$, then open C^∞ -substacks $\mathcal{X}'$ of $\mathcal{X}$ correspond to G -invariant open subsets $U' \subseteq U$.*

Proof. From Theorem 7.20, as $\mathcal{X} = [\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ we have a natural surjective, representable 1-morphism $\Pi : \underline{\bar{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{X}'$ is an open C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{X}$ then $\underline{\bar{U}} \times_{\Pi, \mathcal{X}, i_{\mathcal{X}'}} \mathcal{X}'$ is an open C^∞ -substack of $\underline{\bar{U}}$, and so is of the form $(\bar{U}', \mathcal{O}_{\bar{U}}|_{\bar{U}'})$ for some open $U' \subseteq U$. We have natural 1-isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(s^{-1}(U'), \mathcal{O}_V|_{s^{-1}(U')})} &= \bar{U}' \times_{i_{\bar{U}'}, \bar{U}, \bar{s}} \bar{V} \cong \mathcal{X}' \times_{\mathcal{X}} (\bar{U} \times_{i_{\bar{U}}, \bar{U}, \bar{s}} \bar{V}) \cong \mathcal{X}' \times_{i_{\mathcal{X}'}, \mathcal{X}, \pi_{\mathcal{X}}} \bar{V} \\ &\cong \mathcal{X}' \times_{\mathcal{X}} (\bar{U} \times_{i_{\bar{U}}, \bar{U}, \bar{t}} \bar{V}) \cong \bar{U}' \times_{i_{\bar{U}'}, \bar{U}, \bar{t}} \bar{V} = \overline{(t^{-1}(U'), \mathcal{O}_V|_{t^{-1}(U')})}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $s^{-1}(U') = t^{-1}(U')$. Conversely, if $s^{-1}(U') = t^{-1}(U')$ then defining $\underline{U}', \underline{V}'$ as in the proposition, it is easy to show that we get a groupoid stack $\mathcal{X}' = [\underline{V}' \rightrightarrows \underline{U}']$ which is naturally an open C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{X}$. When $\mathcal{X} = [\underline{U}/\underline{G}]$, we see that $s^{-1}(U') = t^{-1}(U')$ if and only if U' is G -invariant. $\square$

8.4 Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks

Deligne–Mumford stacks in algebraic geometry were introduced in [8] to study moduli spaces of algebraic curves. As in [24, Th. 6.2], Deligne–Mumford stacks are locally modelled (in the étale topology) on quotient stacks $[X/G]$ for X an affine scheme and G a finite group. This motivates:

Definition 8.16. A *Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack* is a C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ which admits an open cover $\{\mathcal{Y}_a : a \in A\}$, as in Definition 8.13, with each $\mathcal{Y}_a$ equivalent to a quotient stack $[\underline{U}_a/G_a]$ for $\underline{U}_a$ an affine C^∞ -scheme and G_a a finite group. We call $\mathcal{X}$ a *locally fair*, or *locally good*, or *locally finitely presented*, Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack if it admits such an open cover with each $\underline{U}_a$ a fair, or good, or finitely presented, affine C^∞ -scheme, respectively. Write $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lfp}}$ and $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ for the full 2-subcategories of locally fair, locally good, locally finitely presented, and all, Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, respectively.

Proposition 8.17. $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lfp}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ are closed under taking open C^∞ -substacks in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}$ lie in one of these 2-categories, and $\mathcal{X}'$ be an open C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{X}$. Then $\mathcal{X}$ admits an open cover $\{\mathcal{Y}_a : a \in A\}$ with $\mathcal{Y}_a \simeq [\underline{U}_a/G_a]$ with $\underline{U}_a$ affine and G_a finite, and $\{\mathcal{Y}'_a : a \in A\}$ is an open cover of $\mathcal{X}'$, where $\mathcal{Y}'_a = \mathcal{Y}_a \times_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{X}'$ is an open C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{Y}_a$. Thus $\mathcal{Y}'_a \simeq [\underline{U}'_a/G_a]$ by Proposition 8.15, where $\underline{U}'_a$ is a G_a -invariant open C^∞ -subscheme of $\underline{U}_a$. If the $\underline{U}_a$ are fair, good, or finitely presented then the $\underline{U}'_a$ are too by Proposition 4.18. Thus $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lg}}, \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lfp}}$ are closed under open subsets.

For **DMC[∞]Sta**, as open subsets of affine C^∞ -schemes need not be affine, the $\underline{U}'_a$ need not be affine. We will show that we can cover $\underline{U}'_a$ by G_a -invariant open affine C^∞ -subschemes $\underline{U}'_{au}$. Write $\underline{U}'_a = (U'_a, \mathcal{O}_{\underline{U}'_a})$ and $G_a = (G_a, \mathcal{O}_{G_a})$. Then the finite group G_a acts continuously on U'_a . Let $u \in U'_a$, and $H_u = \{\gamma \in G_a : \gamma u = u\}$ be the stabilizer of u in G_a . Then the orbit $\{\gamma u : \gamma \in G\} \cong G_a/H_u$ of u is a finite set, so as U'_a is Hausdorff we can choose affine open neighbourhoods $V_{\gamma u}$ of γu for each point in the orbit such that $V_{\gamma u} \cap V_{\gamma' u} = \emptyset$ if $\gamma u \neq \gamma' u$. Define $W_u = \bigcap_{\gamma \in G} \gamma^{-1} V_{\gamma u}$. Then W_u is an H_u -invariant open neighbourhood of u in U'_a , and if $\gamma \in G_a \setminus H_u$ then $\gamma W_u \cap W_u = \emptyset$.

By Lemma 4.20 we can choose an affine open neighbourhood W'_u of u in W_u . Define $W''_u = \bigcap_{\gamma \in H_u} W'_u$, an H_u -invariant open neighbourhood of u in W_u . This is a finite intersection of affine open C^∞ -subschemes $\underline{W}'_u$ in the affine C^∞ -scheme $\underline{U}_u$, and so is affine, since intersection is a kind of fibre product, and **AC[∞]Sch** is closed under fibre products by Theorem 4.12. Define $U'_{au} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in G_a} W''_u$. Then U'_{au} is a G_a -invariant open neighbourhood of u in U'_a . Since W''_u is H_u -invariant and $\gamma W''_u \cap W''_u = \emptyset$ if $\gamma \in G_a \setminus H_u$, we see that U'_{au} is isomorphic to the disjoint union of $|G_a|/|H_u|$ copies of W''_u . Hence $\underline{U}'_{au} = (U'_{au}, \mathcal{O}_{\underline{U}'_a}|_{U'_{au}})$ is a finite disjoint union of affine C^∞ -schemes, and is an affine C^∞ -scheme. Therefore we may cover $\underline{U}'_a$ by G_a -invariant open affine C^∞ -subschemes $\underline{U}'_{au}$. Using these we obtain an open cover $\{\mathcal{Y}'_{au} : a \in A, u \in U_a\}$ of $\mathcal{X}'$ with $\mathcal{Y}'_{au} \simeq [\underline{U}'_{au}/G_a]$, so $\mathcal{X}'$ is Deligne–Mumford. $\square$

The proof of Proposition 8.17 only uses $\underline{U}_a = (U_a, \mathcal{O}_{U_a})$ a C^∞ -scheme and U_a Hausdorff, it does not need $\underline{U}_a$ to be affine. So the same proof yields:

Proposition 8.18. *Any C^∞ -stack of the form $[\underline{X}/G]$ with $\underline{X}$ a separated C^∞ -scheme and G finite is a separated Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack.*

However, if $\underline{X}$ is not separated then $[\underline{X}/G]$ need not be Deligne–Mumford:

Example 8.19. Let $\underline{X}$ be the nonseparated C^∞ -scheme $(\mathbb{R} \amalg \mathbb{R})/\sim$, where $\sim$ is the equivalence relation which identifies the two copies of $\mathbb{R}$ on $(0, \infty)$. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ act on $\underline{X}$ by exchanging the two copies of $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the quotient C^∞ -stack $[\underline{X}/G]$. We can think of $\mathcal{X}$ as a like copy of $\mathbb{R}$, where the stabilizer group of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is $\{1\}$ if $x \in (-\infty, 0]$ and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ if $x \in (0, \infty)$. Using the obvious atlas $\Pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, the third diagram of (50) yields a 2-Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R} \amalg \overline{(0, \infty)} & \longrightarrow & I_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \Pi & \downarrow \iota_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}. \end{array}$$

As the left hand column is not proper, $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}$ is not proper, so $\mathcal{X}$ is not Deligne–Mumford by Corollary 8.23 below.

Proposition 8.20. *Suppose $g : [\underline{X}/F] \rightarrow [\underline{Z}/H]$, $h : [\underline{Y}/G] \rightarrow [\underline{Z}/H]$ are 1-morphisms of quotient C^∞ -stacks, where $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ are C^∞ -schemes and F, G, H*

are finite groups. Then we have a 2-Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\underline{W}/(F \times G)] & \xrightarrow{f} & [\underline{Y}/G] \\ e \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow h \\ [\underline{X}/F] & \xrightarrow{g} & [\underline{Z}/H], \end{array} \quad (56)$$

where $\Pi_{\underline{X}} : \bar{\underline{X}} \rightarrow [\underline{X}/F]$, $\Pi_{\underline{Y}} : \bar{\underline{Y}} \rightarrow [\underline{Y}/G]$, $\Pi_{\underline{Z}} : \bar{\underline{Z}} \rightarrow [\underline{Z}/H]$ are the natural atlases and $\bar{\underline{W}} = \bar{\underline{X}} \times_{g \circ \Pi_{\underline{X}}, [\underline{Z}/H], h \circ \Pi_{\underline{Y}}} \bar{\underline{Y}}$. If $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ are separated, or locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented, then $\underline{W}$ is separated, or locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented, respectively.

Proof. Write $\mathcal{W} = [\underline{X}/F] \times_{[\underline{Z}/H]} [\underline{Y}/G]$. Then from the atlases $\Pi_{\underline{X}}, \Pi_{\underline{Y}}$, Example 7.22 constructs an atlas $\Pi_{\underline{W}} : \bar{\underline{W}} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ for $\mathcal{W}$. Since $[\underline{X}/F] \simeq [F \times \underline{X} \rightrightarrows \underline{X}]$ and $[\underline{Y}/G] \simeq [G \times \underline{Y} \rightrightarrows \underline{Y}]$ it follows from (53) that $\mathcal{W}$ is equivalent to the groupoid stack $[(F \times G) \times \underline{W} \rightrightarrows \underline{W}]$ for a natural action of $F \times G$ on $\underline{W}$. This proves (56).

If $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ are separated then $[\underline{Z}/H]$ is Deligne–Mumford by Proposition 8.18, so $\Delta_{[\underline{Z}/H]}$ is separated by Corollary 8.23 below, and thus $\bar{\underline{W}}$ is separated as $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ are and $\bar{\underline{W}} \cong (\bar{\underline{X}} \times \bar{\underline{Y}}) \times_{[\underline{Z}/H] \times [\underline{Z}/H], \Delta_{[\underline{Z}/H]}} [\underline{Z}/H]$. Form the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \bar{\underline{W}}' & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bar{\underline{Y}}' & \\ \pi_{\bar{\underline{W}}} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_{\bar{\underline{Y}}} & & \searrow \pi_{\bar{\underline{Z}}} \\ \bar{\underline{W}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bar{\underline{Y}} & \xrightarrow{h \circ \Pi_{\underline{Y}}} & \bar{\underline{Z}} \\ & \searrow \pi_{\underline{X}} & \swarrow \pi_{\underline{Y}} & & \\ & \underline{X} & \xrightarrow{g \circ \Pi_{\underline{X}}} & [\underline{Z}/H] & \end{array}$$

with 2-Cartesian squares, where $\bar{\underline{W}}', \bar{\underline{X}}', \bar{\underline{Y}}'$ are C^∞ -schemes. Then $\pi_{\bar{\underline{W}}}, \pi_{\bar{\underline{X}}}, \pi_{\bar{\underline{Y}}}$ are étale and surjective, as $\Pi_{\underline{Z}}$ is. If $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ are locally fair, then $\bar{\underline{X}}', \bar{\underline{Y}}'$ are locally fair as $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ are and $\pi_{\bar{\underline{X}}}, \pi_{\bar{\underline{Y}}}$ are étale, so $\bar{\underline{W}}' \cong \bar{\underline{X}}' \times_{\bar{\underline{Z}}} \bar{\underline{Y}}'$ is locally fair by Theorem 4.26, and thus $\bar{\underline{W}}$ is locally fair as $\pi_{\bar{\underline{W}}} : \bar{\underline{W}}' \rightarrow \bar{\underline{W}}$ is étale and surjective. The proof for locally good and locally finitely presented is the same. $\square$

Using this we prove:

Theorem 8.21. *The 2-subcategories $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}$, $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}}$, $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lg}}$ and $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lfp}}$ are closed under fibre products in $\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Y}$ be a fibre product of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$. We must show $\mathcal{W}$ is Deligne–Mumford. Now $\mathcal{Z}$ admits an open cover $\{\mathcal{Z}_c : c \in C\}$ with $\mathcal{Z}_c \simeq [\underline{Z}_c/H_c]$ for $\underline{Z}_c$ an affine C^∞ -scheme and H_c finite. For $c \in C$ define $\mathcal{X}_c = \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Z}_c$ and $\mathcal{Y}_c = \mathcal{Y} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Z}_c$, which are open C^∞ -substacks of $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$, and so are Deligne–Mumford by Proposition 8.17. Then $\{\mathcal{X}_c \times_{\mathcal{Z}_c} \mathcal{Y}_c : c \in C\}$ is an open cover of $\mathcal{W}$, so it is enough to prove $\mathcal{X}_c \times_{\mathcal{Z}_c} \mathcal{Y}_c$ is Deligne–Mumford. That is, we may replace $\mathcal{Z}$ by $\mathcal{Z}_c \simeq [\underline{Z}_c/H_c]$.

Similarly, by choosing open covers of $\mathcal{X}_c, \mathcal{Y}_c$ by substacks equivalent to $[\underline{X}/F], [\underline{Y}/G]$, we reduce the problem to showing $[\underline{X}/F] \times_{[\underline{Z}/H]} [\underline{Y}/G]$ is Deligne–Mumford, for $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ affine C^∞ -schemes and F, G, H finite groups. This follows from Propositions 8.18 and 8.20, noting that $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$ are separated as they are

affine, so $\underline{W}$ is separated in Proposition 8.20. This shows $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ is closed under fibre products. For $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}}$, $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lg}}$, $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lfp}}$ we use the same argument with $\underline{Z}_c, \underline{Z}, \underline{X}, \underline{Y}, \underline{W}$ locally fair, and so on. $\square$

8.5 Characterizing Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks

We now explore ways to characterize when a C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford.

Proposition 8.22. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a quotient C^∞ -stack $[\underline{U}/G]$ for $\underline{U}$ affine and G finite. Then the natural 1-morphism $\Pi : \bar{\underline{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an étale atlas, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$, $\iota_{\mathcal{X}} : I_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ are universally closed, proper, and separated, with finite fibres, and $j_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow I_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an open and closed embedding.*

Proof. As in (50) we have 2-Cartesian diagrams with surjective rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{G} \times \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bar{\underline{U}} \\ \bar{\pi}_{\underline{U}} \downarrow & \nearrow \bar{\mu} & \Pi \downarrow \\ \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{G} \times \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \\ \bar{\pi}_{\underline{U}} \times \bar{\mu} \downarrow & \nearrow \begin{smallmatrix} \Pi \circ \bar{\pi}_{\underline{U}} \\ \Pi \times \Pi \end{smallmatrix} & \Delta_{\mathcal{X}} \downarrow \\ \bar{\underline{U}} \times \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\bar{G} \times \bar{\underline{U}}) \times_{\bar{\underline{U}} \times \bar{\underline{U}}} \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I_{\mathcal{X}} \\ \bar{\pi}_{\underline{U}} \downarrow & \nearrow \bar{\mu} & \iota_{\mathcal{X}} \downarrow \\ \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X} \\ (1 \times \text{id}_{\bar{\underline{U}}}) \times \text{id}_{\bar{\underline{U}}} \downarrow & \nearrow \Pi & j_{\mathcal{X}} \downarrow \\ (\bar{G} \times \bar{\underline{U}}) \times_{\bar{\underline{U}} \times \bar{\underline{U}}} \bar{\underline{U}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I_{\mathcal{X}} \end{array}$$

The left column $\bar{\pi}_{\underline{U}}$ in the first diagram is étale. The left columns in the second and third diagrams are both universally closed, proper, and separated, with finite fibres, since G is finite with the discrete topology, and $\underline{U}$ is Hausdorff as $\underline{U}$ is affine. This left column in the fourth is an open and closed embedding. The result now follows from Propositions 7.15(c) and 8.10. $\square$

Propositions 8.10, 8.14 and 8.22 now imply:

Corollary 8.23. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Then $\mathcal{X}$ has an étale atlas $\Pi : \bar{\underline{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, the diagonal $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is separated with finite fibres, and the inertia morphism $\iota_{\mathcal{X}} : I_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is universally closed, proper, and separated, with finite fibres, and $j_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow I_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an open and closed embedding. If $\mathcal{X}$ is separated then $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is also universally closed and proper.*

The last part holds as then $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is universally closed with finite fibres, which implies $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is proper. Note that for $\mathcal{X}$ not separated we cannot conclude from Proposition 8.22 that $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is universally closed or proper, since these properties are not stable under open embedding. Some of the conclusions of Corollary 8.23 are sufficient for $\mathcal{X}$ to be separated and Deligne–Mumford.

Theorem 8.24. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack, and suppose $\mathcal{X}$ has an étale atlas $\Pi : \bar{\underline{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and the diagonal $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is universally closed and separated. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is a separated Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack.*

Proof. Let $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ be the groupoid in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ constructed from $\Pi : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ as in §7.5, so that $\mathcal{X} \simeq [\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$. Then (50) gives 2-Cartesian diagrams with surjective rows. From the first and Propositions 7.15(a) and 8.10 we see that $\underline{s}, \underline{t}$ are étale, since Π is. From the second $\underline{s} \times \underline{t} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U} \times \underline{U}$ is universally closed and separated, as $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is. Let $p \in U$. Define

$$H = \{q \in V : s(q) = t(q) = p\} \subseteq s^{-1}(\{p\}).$$

It has the discrete topology, as $\underline{s}, \underline{t}$ are étale.

Suppose for a contradiction that H is infinite. Define a C^∞ -ring

$$\mathfrak{C} = \{c : H \amalg \{\infty\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : c(q) = c(\infty) \text{ for all but finitely many } q \in H\},$$

with C^∞ operations defined pointwise in $H \amalg \{\infty\}$. Then $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ has underlying topological space the one point compactification $H \amalg \{\infty\}$ of the discrete topological space H . Define $\underline{g} : \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \underline{U} \times \underline{U}$ to project $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ to the point (p, p) . Then the morphism

$$\pi_{\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}} : \underline{V} \times_{\underline{s} \times \underline{t}, \underline{U} \times \underline{U}, \underline{g}} \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \longrightarrow \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C} \quad (57)$$

is the projection $H \times (H \amalg \{\infty\}) \rightarrow H \amalg \{\infty\}$. The diagonal in H is closed in $H \times (H \amalg \{\infty\})$, but its image is H , which is not closed in $H \amalg \{\infty\}$. Hence (57) is not a closed morphism, contradicting $\underline{s} \times \underline{t}$ universally closed. So H is finite.

As $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ is a groupoid, H is a *finite group*, with identity $u(p)$, inverse map $i|_H$, and multiplication $m_H = m|_{H \times H}$. Since $\underline{s}, \underline{t}$ are étale, we can choose small open neighbourhoods Z_q of q in V for all $q \in H$ such that $\underline{s}|_{Z_q}, \underline{t}|_{Z_q}$ are isomorphisms with open subsets of $\underline{U}$. As $\underline{s} \times \underline{t}$ is separated, $\{(v, v') : v \in V\}$ is closed in $\{(v, v') \in V \times V : s(v) = s(v'), t(v) = t(v')\}$, which has the subspace topology from $V \times V$. If $q \neq q' \in H$ then (q, q') lies in $\{(v, v') \in V \times V : s(v) = s(v'), t(v) = t(v')\}$ but not in $\{(v, v') : v \in V\}$, so (q, q') has an open neighbourhood in $V \times V$ which does not intersect $\{(v, v') : v \in V\}$. Making $Z_q, Z_{q'}$ smaller if necessary, we can take this open neighbourhood to be $Z_q \times Z_{q'}$, and then $Z_q \cap Z_{q'} = \emptyset$. Thus, we can choose these open neighbourhoods Z_q for $q \in H$ to be *disjoint*.

Define $Y = \bigcap_{q \in H} s(Z_q)$ and $\underline{Y} = (Y, \mathcal{O}_U|_Y)$. Then Y is a small open neighbourhood of p in U . Making Y smaller if necessary we can suppose it is contained in an affine open neighbourhood of p in U , and so is Hausdorff. Replace Z_q by $Z_q \cap s^{-1}(Y)$ for all $q \in H$. Then $s|_{Z_q} : (Z_q, \mathcal{O}_V|_{Z_q}) \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is an isomorphism for $q \in H$. Set $Z = \bigcup_{q \in H} Z_q$, noting the union is disjoint, and $\underline{Z} = (Z, \mathcal{O}_V|_Z)$. Then we have an isomorphism $\underline{\phi} = (\phi, \phi^\#) : H \times \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$, such that $\underline{s} \circ \underline{\phi} = \text{id}_{\underline{Y}}$ and $\phi(q \times Y) = Z_q$ for $q \in H$.

Now $\underline{Z}$ is open in $\underline{V}$, so $\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z}$ is open in $\underline{V} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{V}$, and we can restrict the morphism $\underline{m} : \underline{V} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ to $\underline{m}|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z}} : \underline{Z} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z} \rightarrow \underline{V}$. But

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Z} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z} &\cong (H \times \underline{Y}) \times_{i_{\underline{Y}} \circ \pi_{\underline{Y}}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z} \\ &\cong H \times (Z \cap t^{-1}(Y), \mathcal{O}_V|_{Z \cap t^{-1}(Y)}) \subseteq H \times \underline{Z} \cong H \times H \times \underline{Y}, \end{aligned}$$

using ϕ an isomorphism and $\underline{s} \circ \phi = \text{id}_{\underline{Y}}$. Write $\underline{\Phi} : \underline{Z} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z} \hookrightarrow H \times H \times \underline{Y}$ for the induced open embedding. Define a second morphism $\underline{m}' : \underline{Z} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ by $\underline{m}' = \phi \circ (\underline{m}_H \times \text{id}_{\underline{Y}}) \circ \underline{\Phi}$, where $\underline{m}_H : H \times H \rightarrow H$ is the group multiplication $m_H : H \times H \rightarrow H$, regarded as a morphism of C^∞ -schemes.

Following the definitions we find that $\underline{s} \circ (\underline{m}|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}}) = \underline{s} \circ \underline{m}' : \underline{Z} \times_{\underline{s}, \underline{U}, \underline{t}} \underline{Z} \rightarrow \underline{Y} \subset \underline{U}$. Also $H \subset Z$, and the definition of m_H from $\underline{m}$ implies that $m|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}}$ and m' coincide on the finite set $H \times_{\underline{U}} H$ in $\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}$. Since $\underline{s}$ is étale, this implies that $\underline{m}|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}}$ and $\underline{m}'$ must coincide near the finite set $H \times_{\underline{U}} H$ in $\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}$. Therefore by making the open neighbourhood Y of p in U smaller, and hence making W_q, W, Z smaller too, we can assume that $\underline{m}|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}} = \underline{m}'$.

Let us summarize what we have done so far. We have constructed a finite group H , a Hausdorff open neighbourhood $\underline{Y}$ of p in $\underline{U}$, an open and closed subset $\underline{Z}$ of $\underline{s}^{-1}(\underline{Y})$ in $\underline{Z}$ which contains $s^{-1}(p) \cap t^{-1}(p)$, and an isomorphism $\phi : H \times \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ with $\underline{s} \circ \phi = \pi_{\underline{Y}}$ which identifies the groupoid multiplication $\underline{m}|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}}$ with the restriction to $\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}$ of the morphism $\underline{m}_H \times \text{id}_{\underline{Y}} : H \times H \times \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ from multiplication in the finite group H .

Consider the morphism $\underline{t} \circ \phi : H \times \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{U} \supset \underline{Y}$. Roughly speaking, $\underline{t} \circ \phi$ is an H -action on $\underline{Y}$. More accurately, there should be an H -action on some open subset of $\underline{U}$ containing $\underline{Y}$, but $\underline{Y}$ may not be H -invariant, so that $\underline{t} \circ \phi$ need not map $H \times \underline{Y}$ to $\underline{Y}$. Replace Y by $Y' = \bigcap_{q \in H} t(Z_q)$, which is an open subset of Y since when q is the identity $u(p)$ in H we have $t(Z_{u(p)}) = s(Z_{u(p)}) = Y$, and $p \in Y'$ as $p = t(q) \in t(Z_q)$ for $q \in H$. Replace Z_q by $Z'_q = Z_q \cap s^{-1}(Y')$ and Z by $Z' = \bigcup_{q \in H} Z'_q$. Then using $\underline{m}|_{\underline{Z} \times_{\underline{U}} \underline{Z}} = \underline{m}'$ we can show that $s(Z'_q) = t(Z'_q) = Y'$ for all $q \in H$, so Y' is an H -invariant open set, and $\underline{t} \circ \phi$ maps $H \times \underline{Y}' \rightarrow \underline{Y}'$. Restricting the groupoid axioms shows that $\underline{t} \circ \phi$ gives an action of H on $\underline{Y}'$.

Now consider the morphism

$$\underline{s} \times \underline{t}|_{s^{-1}(Y') \cap t^{-1}(Y')} : (s^{-1}(Y') \cap t^{-1}(Y'), \mathcal{O}_V|_{s^{-1}(Y') \cap t^{-1}(Y')}) \longrightarrow \underline{Y}' \times \underline{Y}'.$$

This is closed, as $\underline{s} \times \underline{t}$ is universally closed. Since Z' is open and closed in $s^{-1}(Y') \cap t^{-1}(Y')$, its complement is closed, so its image $\{(s(v), t(v)) \in Y' \times Y' : v \in V \setminus Z'\}$ is closed in Y' . But (p, p) does not lie in this image, since $s^{-1}(p) \cap t^{-1}(p) \subseteq Z'$. Thus, by making the H -invariant open neighbourhood Y' of p in U smaller if necessary, we can suppose that $s^{-1}(Y') \cap t^{-1}(Y') = Z'$.

The quotient C^∞ -stack $[\underline{Y}'/H]$ is Deligne–Mumford by Proposition 8.18, since Y' is Hausdorff. Thus there exists an open embedding $\mathcal{Y}_p \hookrightarrow [\underline{Y}'/H]$ with $\mathcal{Y}_p \simeq [\underline{U}_p/G_p]$ for $\underline{U}_p$ affine and G_p finite, which includes p in its image. The inclusion morphisms $\underline{Y}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}$, $\underline{Z}' \hookrightarrow \underline{V}$ induce a 1-morphism $[\underline{Z}' \rightrightarrows \underline{Y}'] \hookrightarrow [\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$, which is an open embedding as $\underline{Y}'$ is open in $\underline{U}$, $\underline{Z}'$ is open in $\underline{V}$ and $s^{-1}(Y') \cap t^{-1}(Y') = Z'$ in V . Let $i_{\mathcal{Y}_p} : \mathcal{Y}_p \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be the composition $\mathcal{Y}_p \hookrightarrow [\underline{Y}'/H] \simeq [\underline{Z}' \rightrightarrows \underline{Y}'] \hookrightarrow [\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}] \simeq \mathcal{X}$. Then $i_{\mathcal{Y}_p}$ is an open embedding, as it is a composition of open embeddings and equivalences. This works for all $p \in U$, and $\{\mathcal{Y}_p : p \in U\}$ is an open cover of $\mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{Y}_p \simeq [\underline{U}_p/G_p]$ for $\underline{U}_p$ affine and G_p finite. Hence $\mathcal{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford. It is separated as $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is universally closed, by assumption. $\square$

Suppose $f : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ is a separated morphism of C^∞ -schemes with finite

fibres. Then $\underline{f}$ universally closed implies $\underline{f}$ proper. Conversely, if X, Y are compactly generated topological spaces then $\underline{f}$ proper implies $\underline{f}$ universally closed. If $\underline{X}, \underline{Y}$ are locally fair then X, Y are compactly generated, as they are locally homeomorphic to closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, in Theorem 8.24, if $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ are locally fair then we can replace $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ universally closed by $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ proper, yielding:

Theorem 8.25. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack, and suppose $\mathcal{X}$ has an étale atlas $\Pi : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ with $\underline{U}$ locally fair, and the diagonal $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is proper and separated. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is a separated, locally fair Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack.*

The same holds with locally good or locally finitely presented in place of locally fair. If $\mathcal{X} \simeq [\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ with $\underline{U}$ a separated C^∞ -scheme then $\underline{V}$ is separated if and only if $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is separated. We can always choose $\underline{U}$ separated, by replacing $\underline{U}$ by the disjoint union of an open cover of $\underline{U}$ by affine open subsets. Thus we can replace the condition that $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is separated by $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ separated. Combining this and the results above proves:

Theorem 8.26. (a) *A C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ is separated and Deligne–Mumford if and only if it is equivalent to a groupoid stack $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ where $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ are separated C^∞ -schemes, $\underline{s} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U}$ is étale, and $\underline{s} \times \underline{t} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U} \times \underline{U}$ is universally closed.*

(b) *A C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ is separated, Deligne–Mumford and locally fair (or locally good, or locally finitely presented) if and only if it is equivalent to some $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ with $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ separated, locally fair (or locally good, or locally finitely presented) C^∞ -schemes, $\underline{s} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U}$ étale, and $\underline{s} \times \underline{t} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U} \times \underline{U}$ proper.*

8.6 The underlying topological space of a C^∞ -stack

Following Noohi [34, §4.3, §11] in the case of topological stacks, we associate a topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ to a C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$. In §8.7, if $\mathcal{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford, we will also give $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ the structure of a C^∞ -scheme.

Definition 8.27. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack. Write $\underline{*}$ for the point $\text{Spec } \mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, and $\bar{*}$ for the associated point in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$. Define $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ to be the set of 2-isomorphism classes $[x]$ of 1-morphisms $x : \bar{*} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. When $i_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an open C^∞ -substack in $\mathcal{X}$, write

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} = \{[u \circ i_{\mathcal{U}}] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}} : u : \bar{*} \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \text{ is a 1-morphism}\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}.$$

Define $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}} = \{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} : i_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \text{ is an open } C^\infty\text{-substack in } \mathcal{X}\}.$

We claim that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}}$ is a topology on $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. To see this, note that taking $\mathcal{U}$ to be $\mathcal{X}$ or the empty C^∞ -substack gives $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}, \emptyset \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}}$. If $i_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $i_{\mathcal{V}} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ are open C^∞ -substacks of $\mathcal{X}$ then $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U} \times_{i_{\mathcal{U}}, \mathcal{X}, i_{\mathcal{V}}} \mathcal{V}$ is an open C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}}$, so $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}}$ is closed under finite intersections. If $\{\mathcal{U}_a : a \in A\}$ is a family of open C^∞ -substacks in $\mathcal{X}$ then each $\mathcal{U}_a$ is a subcategory of $\mathcal{X}$, so $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{a \in A} \mathcal{U}_a$ is a subcategory of $\mathcal{X}$. It turns out that $\mathcal{V}$ is a prestack, and the associated stack $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is an open C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{X}$ with $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} = \bigcup_{a \in A} \mathcal{U}_a_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}}$. So $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}}$ is closed under arbitrary unions.

Thus $(\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}})$ is a topological space, which we call the *underlying topological space* of $\mathcal{X}$, and usually write as $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. It has the following properties. If $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a 1-morphism of C^∞ -stacks then there is a natural continuous map $f_{\text{top}} : \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_{\text{top}}$ defined by $f_{\text{top}}([x]) = [f \circ x]$. If $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ are 1-morphisms and $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$ is a 2-isomorphism then $f_{\text{top}} = g_{\text{top}}$. Mapping $\mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, $f \mapsto f_{\text{top}}$ and 2-morphisms to identities defines a 2-functor $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{Top}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Sta} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$, where the category of topological spaces $\mathbf{Top}$ is regarded as a 2-category with only identity 2-morphisms.

If $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a C^∞ -scheme, so that $\bar{\underline{X}}$ is a C^∞ -stack, then $\bar{\underline{X}}_{\text{top}}$ is naturally homeomorphic to X , and we will identify $\bar{\underline{X}}_{\text{top}}$ with X . If $\underline{f} = (f, f^\#) : \underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \underline{Y} = (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is a morphism of C^∞ -schemes, so that $\bar{\underline{f}} : \bar{\underline{X}} \rightarrow \bar{\underline{Y}}$ is a 1-morphism of C^∞ -stacks, then $\bar{\underline{f}}_{\text{top}} : \bar{\underline{X}}_{\text{top}} \rightarrow \bar{\underline{Y}}_{\text{top}}$ is $f : X \rightarrow Y$.

For a C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$, we can characterize $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ by the following universal property. We are given a topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ and for every 1-morphism $f : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ for a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$ we are given a continuous map $f_{\text{top}} : U \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, such that if f is 2-isomorphic to $h \circ \bar{g}$ for some morphism $\bar{g} = (g, g^\#) : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ and 1-morphism $h : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ then $f_{\text{top}} = h_{\text{top}} \circ g$. If $\mathcal{X}'_{\text{top}}, f'_{\text{top}}$ are alternative choices of data with these properties then there is a unique continuous map $j : \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'_{\text{top}}$ with $f'_{\text{top}} = j \circ f_{\text{top}}$ for all f .

We can think of a C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ as being a topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ equipped with some complicated extra geometrical structure, just as manifolds and orbifolds are usually thought of as topological spaces equipped with extra structure coming from an atlas of charts. As in Noohi [34, Ex. 4.13], it is easy to describe $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ using a groupoid presentation $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ of $\mathcal{X}$:

Proposition 8.28. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be equivalent to a groupoid stack $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ from a groupoid $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{Sch}$, where $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$, $\underline{s} = (s, s^\#)$, and so on. Define $\sim$ on U by $p \sim p'$ if there exists $q \in V$ with $s(q) = p$ and $t(q) = p'$. Then $\sim$ is an equivalence relation on U , so we can form the quotient $U/\sim$, with the quotient topology. There is a natural homeomorphism $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}} \cong U/\sim$.*

For a quotient stack $\mathcal{X} \simeq [\underline{U}/\underline{G}]$ we have $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}} \cong U/G$.

Using this we can deduce properties of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ from properties of $\mathcal{X}$ expressed in terms of $\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}$. For instance, if $\mathcal{X}$ is separated then $s \times t : V \rightarrow U \times U$ is (universally) closed, and we can take U Hausdorff. But the quotient of a Hausdorff topological space by a closed equivalence relation is Hausdorff, yielding:

Lemma 8.29. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a separated C^∞ -stack. Then the underlying topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ is Hausdorff.*

Next we discuss *stabilizer groups* of C^∞ -stacks.

Definition 8.30. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack, and $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. Pick a representative x for $[x]$, so that $x : \underline{x} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a 1-morphism. Then there exists a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{G} = (G, \mathcal{O}_G)$, unique up to isomorphism, with $\underline{G} = \underline{x} \times_{x, \mathcal{X}, x} \underline{x}$. Applying the construction of the groupoid in Definition 7.18 with $\Pi : U \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ replaced by

$x : \bar{x} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, we give $\underline{G}$ the structure of a C^∞ -group. The underlying group G has a simple interpretation as the group of 2-morphisms $\eta : x \Rightarrow x$.

With $[x]$ fixed, this C^∞ -group $\underline{G}$ is independent of choices up to noncanonical isomorphism; roughly, $\underline{G}$ is canonical up to conjugation in $\underline{G}$. We define the *stabilizer group* (or *isotropy group*, or *orbifold group*) $\text{Iso}([x])$ of $[x]$ to be this C^∞ -group $\underline{G}$, regarded as a C^∞ -group up to noncanonical isomorphism.

If $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a 1-morphism of C^∞ -stacks and $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ with $f_{\text{top}}([x]) = [y] \in \mathcal{Y}_{\text{top}}$, for $y = f \circ x$, then we define $f_* : \text{Iso}([x]) \rightarrow \text{Iso}([y])$ by $f_*(\eta) = \text{id}_f * \eta$. One can show that f_* is a group morphism, and extends naturally to a morphism of C^∞ -groups, and that f_* is independent of choices of $x \in [x]$ and $y \in [y]$ up to conjugation in $\text{Iso}([x]), \text{Iso}([y])$.

If $\mathcal{X}$ is a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack then $\text{Iso}([x])$ is a finite group for all $[x]$ in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, which is discrete as a C^∞ -group. We show that $\mathcal{X}$ is modelled near $[x]$ on a quotient $[\underline{U}/\text{Iso}([x])]$, for $\underline{U}$ an affine C^∞ -scheme.

Proposition 8.31. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack and $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, so that $\text{Iso}([x]) \cong H$ for some finite group H . Then there exists an open C^∞ -substack $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{X}$ with $[x] \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ and an equivalence $\mathcal{U} \simeq [\underline{Y}/H]$, where $\underline{Y} = (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is an affine C^∞ -scheme with an action of H , and $[x] \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}} \cong Y/H$ corresponds to a fixed point of H in Y .*

Proof. As $\mathcal{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford it is covered by open C^∞ -substacks $\mathcal{V}$ equivalent to $[\underline{V}/G]$ for $\underline{V}$ affine and G finite, so we can choose such $\mathcal{V}$ with $[x] \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}}$. Then $\mathcal{V}$ has an étale atlas $\Pi : \bar{\underline{V}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{V}}$ is universally closed and separated by Proposition 8.22, so we can apply the proof of Theorem 8.24 to $\mathcal{V}$ for a point $p \in V$ with $\Pi_*(p) = [x]$. This constructs an open C^∞ -substack $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{V}$ equivalent to $[\underline{Y}/H]$, where $\underline{Y}$ is affine and $H = \text{Iso}([x])$, as we want. $\square$

If $\mathcal{X} = \bar{\underline{X}}$ for some C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$ then $\text{Iso}([x]) \cong \{1\}$ for all $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. Conversely, a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack with trivial stabilizer groups is a C^∞ -scheme. In conventional algebraic geometry, a Deligne–Mumford stack with trivial stabilizers is an algebraic space, but need not be a scheme.

Theorem 8.32. *Suppose $\mathcal{X}$ is a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack with $\text{Iso}([x]) \cong \{1\}$ for all $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to $\bar{\underline{X}}$ for some C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$.*

Proof. As $\text{Iso}([x]) \cong \{1\}$ for all $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, by Proposition 8.31 there is an open cover $\{\mathcal{X}_a : a \in A\}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{X}_a \simeq [\underline{X}_a/\{1\}] \simeq \bar{\underline{X}}_a$ for affine C^∞ -schemes $\underline{X}_a$, $a \in A$. Write $i_a : \bar{\underline{X}}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ for the corresponding open embedding. As $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is representable, for $a, b \in A$ the fibre product $\bar{\underline{X}}_a \times_{i_a, \mathcal{X}, i_b} \bar{\underline{X}}_b$ is represented by a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}_{ab} = \underline{X}_{ba}$ with open embeddings $i_{ab} : \underline{X}_{ab} \rightarrow \underline{X}_a$, $i_{ba} : \underline{X}_{ba} \rightarrow \underline{X}_b$ identifying $\underline{X}_{ab}$ with open C^∞ -subschemes of $\underline{X}_a, \underline{X}_b$.

The idea now is that the C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ is made by gluing the C^∞ -schemes $\underline{X}_a$ for $a \in A$ together on the overlaps $\underline{X}_{ab}$, that is, we identify $\underline{X}_a \supset i_{ab}(\underline{X}_{ab}) \cong \underline{X}_{ab} = \underline{X}_{ba} \cong i_{ba}(\underline{X}_{ba}) \subset \underline{X}_b$. This is similar to the notion of descent for objects in §7.3, and it is easy to check that the natural 1-isomorphisms

$$\bar{\underline{X}}_{ab} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{\underline{X}}_c \cong \bar{\underline{X}}_{bc} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{\underline{X}}_a \cong \bar{\underline{X}}_{ca} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{\underline{X}}_b \cong \bar{\underline{X}}_a \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{\underline{X}}_b \times_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{\underline{X}}_c$$

imply the obvious compatibility conditions of the gluing morphisms $\bar{i}_{ab}$ on triple overlaps, and that $\underline{X}_{aa} \cong \underline{X}_a$. So by a minor modification of the proof in Proposition 8.2 that $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ has descent for objects, we construct a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$ with open embeddings $j_a : \underline{X}_a \hookrightarrow \underline{X}$ such that $\{\underline{X}_a : a \in A\}$ is an open cover of $\underline{X}$, and $\underline{X}_a \times_{j_a, \underline{X}, j_b} \underline{X}_b$ is identified with $\underline{X}_{ab}$ for $a, b \in A$. Then by descent for morphisms in $(\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$, there exists a 1-morphism $i : \bar{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ with i_a 2-isomorphic to $i \circ \bar{j}_a$ for all $a \in A$. This i is an equivalence, so $\mathcal{X} \simeq \bar{\mathcal{X}}$, as we have to prove. $\square$

We show that $\mathcal{X}$ being Deligne–Mumford is essential in Theorem 8.32:

Example 8.33. Let the group $\mathbb{Z}^2$ act on $\mathbb{R}$ by $(a, b) : x \mapsto x + a + b\sqrt{2}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. As $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational, this is a free action. It defines a groupoid $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbf{Man}$ which is étale, but not proper. Applying $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}$ gives a groupoid $\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, and an associated C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X} = [\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}^2] = [\mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}]$. The underlying topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ is $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Since each orbit of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ in $\mathbb{R}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ has the indiscrete topology, that is, the only open sets are $\emptyset$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. Thus $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ is not homeomorphic to X for any C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, as each point of X has an affine and hence Hausdorff open neighbourhood. Therefore $\mathcal{X}$ is not equivalent to $\underline{X}$ for any C^∞ -scheme $\underline{X}$. So $\mathcal{X}$ is not Deligne–Mumford by Theorem 8.32. Hence, C^∞ -stacks with finite stabilizer groups need not be Deligne–Mumford.

8.7 Coarse moduli C^∞ -schemes of C^∞ -stacks

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack. Then we can give the underlying topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ of §8.6 the structure of a C^∞ -ringed space.

Definition 8.34. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a C^∞ -stack, and write X for the underlying topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$. Define a presheaf of C^∞ -rings $\mathcal{O}'_X$ on X as follows: if $U \subseteq X$ is open then $U = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}, \text{top}}$ for some unique C^∞ -substack $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{X}$. (Since our definition of C^∞ -substack makes $\mathcal{U}$ a strictly full subcategory of $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{U}$ really is unique, not just unique up to equivalence.) Define $\mathcal{O}'_X(U)$ to be the set of 2-isomorphism classes $[c]$ of 1-morphisms $c : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$. If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and $[c_1], \dots, [c_n] \in \mathcal{O}'_X(U)$, define $\Phi_f([c_1], \dots, [c_n]) = [\bar{f} \circ (c_1 \times \dots \times c_n)]$, using the composition $\mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{c_1 \times \dots \times c_n} \bar{\mathbb{R}} \times \dots \times \bar{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \bar{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $\mathcal{O}'_X(U)$ is a C^∞ -ring.

If $V \subseteq U \subseteq X$ are open then U, V correspond to unique open C^∞ -substacks $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{V}$ is also a C^∞ -substack of $\mathcal{U}$, with inclusion $i_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Define $\rho_{UV} : \mathcal{O}'_X(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}'_X(V)$ by $\rho_{UV} : [c] \mapsto [c \circ i_{\mathcal{V}\mathcal{U}}]$. Then ρ_{UV} is a morphism of C^∞ -rings. It is now easy to check that $\mathcal{O}'_X$ is a presheaf of C^∞ -rings on X . Let $\mathcal{O}_X$ be the associated sheaf of C^∞ -rings. Then $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a C^∞ -ringed space, which we call the *underlying C^∞ -ringed space* of $\mathcal{X}$.

For general $\mathcal{X}$ this $\underline{X}$ need not be a C^∞ -scheme, or even a local C^∞ -ringed space. If $\underline{X}$ is a C^∞ -scheme, we call $\underline{X}$ the *coarse moduli C^∞ -scheme* of $\mathcal{X}$. Coarse moduli C^∞ -schemes have the following universal property: there is a 1-morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ called the *structural morphism*, such that $\pi_{\text{top}} : \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}} \rightarrow X$

is a homeomorphism, and if $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ is a 1-morphism for any C^∞ -scheme $\bar{Y}$ then f is 2-isomorphic to $\bar{g} \circ \pi$ for some unique morphism $\bar{g} : \bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{Y}$.

Proposition 8.35. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a fair, or good, or finitely presented C^∞ -ring, and G a finite group acting on $\mathfrak{C}$ by automorphisms. Then $\mathfrak{C}^G$ is a fair, or good, or finitely presented C^∞ -ring.*

Proof. Choose a finite set of generators for $\mathfrak{C}$, and by adding the images of these generators under G , extend to a set of (not necessarily distinct) generators $x_1, \dots, x_n$ for $\mathfrak{C}$, on which G acts freely by permutation. This gives an exact sequence $0 \hookrightarrow I \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow 0$, where $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is freely generated by $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Here $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a direct sum of copies of the regular representation of G , and $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ is G -equivariant. Hence I is a G -invariant ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which is fair, or good, or finitely generated, respectively. Taking G -invariant parts gives an exact sequence $0 \hookrightarrow I^G \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathfrak{C}^G \rightarrow 0$, where $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G, \mathfrak{C}^G$ are clearly C^∞ -rings.

As G acts linearly on $\mathbb{R}^n$ it acts by automorphisms on the polynomial ring $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. By results from algebraic geometry, $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^G$ is a finitely presented $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra, so we can choose generators $p_1, \dots, p_l$ for $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^G$, which induce a surjective $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra morphism $\mathbb{R}[p_1, \dots, p_l] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^G$ with finitely generated kernel generated by $q_1, \dots, q_m \in \mathbb{R}[p_1, \dots, p_l]$.

One can show that any G -invariant smooth function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ may be written as a smooth function of finitely many G -invariant polynomials on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and so as a smooth function of the generators $p_1, \dots, p_l$ for $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^G$. Hence $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G$ is generated by $p_1, \dots, p_l$, giving a surjective morphism $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G$. One can also show the kernel of this morphism is the ideal generated by $q_1, \dots, q_m$. Thus $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G$ is finitely presented.

Also $\mathfrak{C}^G$ is generated by $\pi(p_1), \dots, \pi(p_l)$, so $\mathfrak{C}^G$ is finitely generated, and we have an exact sequence $0 \hookrightarrow J \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathfrak{C}^G \rightarrow 0$, where J is the ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l)$ generated by $q_1, \dots, q_m$ and the lifts to $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l)$ of a generating set for the ideal I^G in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G \cong C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^l)/(q_1, \dots, q_m)$.

Suppose now that I is fair. Then for $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G$, f lies in I^G if and only if $\pi_p(f) \in \pi_p(I) \subset C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If H is the subgroup of G fixing p then H acts on $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\pi_p(f)$ is H -invariant as f is G -invariant, and $\pi_p(I)^H = \pi_p(I^G)$. Thus we may rewrite the condition as f lies in I^G if and only if $\pi_p(f) \in \pi_p(I^G) \subset C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Projecting from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^n/G$, this says that f lies in I^G if and only if $\pi_p(f)$ lies in $\pi_p(I^G) \subset (C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G)_p$ for all $p \in \text{Spec}(C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G) \cong \mathbb{R}^n/G$. Since $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)^G$ is finitely presented, it follows as in [33, Cor. I.4.9] that J is fair, so $\mathfrak{C}^G$ is fair.

Suppose I is finitely generated in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with generators $f_1, \dots, f_k$. As $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a sum of copies of the regular representation of G , so that every irreducible representation of G occurs as a summand of $\mathbb{R}^n$, one can show that I^G is generated as an ideal in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n/G)$ by the $n(k+1)$ elements f_i^G and $(f_i x_j)^G$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$, where $f^G = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\gamma \in G} f \circ \gamma$ is the G -invariant part of $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore J is finitely generated by $q_1, \dots, q_m$ and lifts of $f_i^G, (f_i x_j)^G$. Hence if $\mathfrak{C}$ is finitely presented then $\mathfrak{C}^G$ is finitely presented.

Finally suppose I is good, so $I = (f_1, \dots, f_k, \mathfrak{m}_X^\infty)$ for some closed $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Then as for I finitely generated we find that J is generated by $q_1, \dots, q_m$, lifts of $f_i^G, (f_i x_j)^G$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $\mathfrak{m}_Y^\infty$, where $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ is the image of the closed set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ under the closed map $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n/G \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$, so that Y is closed. Thus J is good. $\square$

Theorem 8.36. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a locally fair, locally good, or locally finitely presented Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Then $\mathcal{X}$ has a locally fair, locally good, or locally finitely presented coarse moduli C^∞ -scheme, respectively.*

Proof. By definition $\mathcal{X}$ can be covered by open C^∞ -substacks $\mathcal{U}$ equivalent to $[\underline{Y}/G]$ for $\underline{Y} = \text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$ with $\mathfrak{C}$ a fair, or good, or finitely presented C^∞ -ring and G a finite group acting on $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}$. Since Spec is fully faithful on fair C^∞ -rings by Theorem 4.9 we have $\text{Aut } \underline{Y} \cong \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, and the action of G on $\underline{Y}$ comes from one on $\mathfrak{C}$. So $\mathfrak{C}^G$ is fair, or good, or finitely presented, by Proposition 8.35.

Use the notation of Definition 8.34, and let U be the open subset of $X = \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{U}$. Then $U \cong Y/G$ by Proposition 8.28. But $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}^G = (Y/G, \mathcal{O}_{Y/G})$, so $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}^G$ and $\mathcal{U}$ have the same underlying topological space. Open sets in Y/G are of the form Z/G for $Z \subseteq Y$ open and G -invariant. From Proposition 4.21 for G -invariant open sets Z in Y , using G -invariant characteristic functions, one can show that $(U, \mathcal{O}'_X|_U)$ is canonically isomorphic to $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}^G$. Thus $\mathcal{O}'_X|_U$ is a sheaf, not just a presheaf, so $\mathcal{O}_X|_U \cong \mathcal{O}'_X|_U$. Therefore X can be covered by open subsets U with $(U, \mathcal{O}_X|_U)$ isomorphic to $\text{Spec } \mathfrak{C}^G$ for $\mathfrak{C}^G$ a fair, or good, or finitely presented C^∞ -ring, so $\underline{X} = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented C^∞ -scheme, respectively. $\square$

8.8 Orbifolds as Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks

Orbifolds (without boundary) are geometric spaces locally modelled on $\mathbb{R}^n/G$ for G a finite group acting linearly on $\mathbb{R}^n$, just as manifolds without boundary are geometric spaces locally modelled on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Much has been written about orbifolds, and there are several competing, nonequivalent definitions. We are particularly interested in the question of whether one regards orbifolds as forming a 1-category, or as a 2-category. See Lerman [25] for a discussion of this.

Orbifolds were introduced by Satake [38], who called them V-manifolds. Satake requires G to act effectively on $\mathbb{R}^n$ in the local models $\mathbb{R}^n/G$, a condition which we omit. Satake intended orbifolds to be a 1-category, but there were problems with his definition(s) of smooth map of orbifolds; it was not clear that smooth maps could be composed, nor whether one could pull back orbifold vector bundles by smooth maps. For attempts at fixing the definition, see Chen and Ruan [7], Moerdijk [29] and Moerdijk and Pronk [30]. Adem, Leida and Ruan [1] is a book on orbifolds, which follows the groupoid point of view of [29, 30]. All these authors regard orbifolds as a 1-category (an ordinary category).

On the other hand, it has been clear for decades that orbifolds are the analogue in differential geometry of Deligne–Mumford stacks in algebraic geometry, but Deligne–Mumford stacks are known to form a 2-category. There are two

main routes in the literature to defining a 2-category of orbifolds **Orb**. The first, as in Pronk [35] and Lerman [25, §3.3], is to define orbifolds to be groupoids (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) in the category **Man** such that $s, t : V \rightarrow U$ are étale and $s \times t : V \rightarrow U \times U$ is proper. That is, orbifolds are considered to be *proper étale Lie groupoids*, as in Moerdijk and Pronk [29, 30]. But to define 1-morphisms and 2-morphisms in **Orb** one must do more work: one makes proper étale Lie groupoids into a 2-category **Gpoid**, and then **Orb** is defined as a (weak) 2-category localization of **Gpoid** at a suitable class of 1-morphisms.

The second route, as in Behrend and Xu [4, §2], Lerman [25, §4] and Metzler [28, §3.5], is to define orbifolds as a class of Deligne–Mumford stacks on the site $(\mathbf{Man}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}})$ of manifolds discussed in Remark 8.4. The relationship between the two routes is discussed by Behrend and Xu [4, §2.6], Lerman [25], and Pronk [35], who proves the two approaches give equivalent weak 2-categories. We take a similar approach to the second route, but defining orbifolds as a class of C^∞ -stacks, that is, as stacks on the site $(C^\infty\mathbf{Sch}, \mathcal{J})$ rather than on $(\mathbf{Man}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}})$.

Definition 8.37. A C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ is called an *orbifold without boundary*, or *with boundary*, or *with corners*, if it is equivalent to a groupoid stack $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ for some groupoid $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, s, t, u, i, m)$ in $C^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ which is the image under $F_{\mathbf{Man}^c}^{C^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}$ of a groupoid (U, V, s, t, u, i, m) in **Man** or $\mathbf{Man}^b$ or $\mathbf{Man}^c$ respectively, where $s : V \rightarrow U$ is an étale smooth map, and $s \times t : V \rightarrow U \times U$ is a proper smooth map. That is, $\mathcal{X}$ is the C^∞ -stack associated to a *proper étale Lie groupoid* in **Man**, $\mathbf{Man}^b$ or $\mathbf{Man}^c$. An *orbifold* will usually mean an orbifold with corners. Write **Orb**, **Orb^b** and **Orb^c** for the full 2-subcategories of orbifolds without boundary, and with boundary, and with corners, in $C^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ respectively; though see Remark 8.38 below on whether **Orb^b**, **Orb^c** should really be full.

If $\mathcal{X}$ is an orbifold without boundary then U, V are manifolds without boundary, so $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ above are finitely presented affine C^∞ -schemes as in §4.2, and thus $\mathcal{X}$ is a separated, locally finitely presented Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack by Theorem 8.26(b). If $\mathcal{X}$ is an orbifold with boundary, or with corners, then $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ are good affine C^∞ -schemes and $\mathcal{X}$ is a separated, locally good Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Thus all these 2-categories satisfy:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathbf{Man} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{Man}^b & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{Man}^c & & \\
\downarrow F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{C^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} & & \downarrow F_{\mathbf{Man}^b}^{C^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} & \swarrow F_{\mathbf{Man}^c}^{C^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} & & & \\
\bar{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \bar{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lg}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \bar{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}^{\text{lf}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \bar{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch} \\
\downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset & & \downarrow \subset \\
\text{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \text{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lg}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \text{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \text{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta} \xrightarrow{\subset} C^\infty\mathbf{Sta} \\
\uparrow \subset & & \uparrow \subset & \swarrow \subset & & & \\
\mathbf{Orb} & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{Orb}^b & \xrightarrow{\subset} & \mathbf{Orb}^c & &
\end{array}$$

Remark 8.38. If we define **Orb^b**, **Orb^c** as *full* 2-subcategories of $C^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ then 1-morphisms in **Orb^b**, **Orb^c** correspond not to smooth maps but to *weakly smooth maps* of manifolds with boundary or corners, as in Proposition 3.4 and

Corollary 4.14. So following the philosophy of [20], arguably one should take 1-morphisms in $\mathbf{Orb}^b, \mathbf{Orb}^c$ to be the proper subset of *smooth* 1-morphisms between orbifolds in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, that is, those 1-morphisms which are locally modelled on smooth maps of manifolds, rather than weakly smooth maps. Then $\mathbf{Orb}^b, \mathbf{Orb}^c$ would not be full 2-subcategories.

Our next theorem compares our definition of orbifold with those in the literature. To prove it, we show that the truncation 2-functor $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{ManSta}}$ of Remark 8.4 maps our 2-subcategory $\mathbf{Orb}$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ to the 2-subcategory of orbifolds as stacks on $(\mathbf{Man}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{Man}})$ in [28, §3.4] or [25, §4] (this is obvious, as both 2-subcategories are defined as objects presented by proper étale Lie groupoids), and that $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathbf{ManSta}}|_{\mathbf{Orb}}$ is an equivalence of 2-categories (this follows from $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}$ being full and faithful, and orbifolds being locally modelled on manifolds). Thus our 2-category of orbifolds is equivalent to those in [28, §3.4], [25, §4], and the rest of the theorem follows from the references.

Theorem 8.39. *The 2-category $\mathbf{Orb}$ of orbifolds without boundary defined above is equivalent to the 2-categories of orbifolds considered as stacks on $\mathbf{Man}$ defined in Metzler [28, §3.4] and Lerman [25, §4], and also equivalent as a weak 2-category to the weak 2-categories of orbifolds regarded as proper étale Lie groupoids defined in Pronk [35] and Lerman [25, §3.3].*

Furthermore, the homotopy 1-category $\mathbf{Orb}^{\text{ho}}$ of $\mathbf{Orb}$ (that is, the category whose objects are objects in $\mathbf{Orb}$, and whose morphisms are 2-isomorphism classes of 1-morphisms in $\mathbf{Orb}$) is equivalent to the 1-category of orbifolds regarded as proper étale Lie groupoids defined in Moerdijk [29].

Since equivalent (2-)categories are considered to be ‘the same’, the basic moral of Theorem 8.39 is that our notion of orbifold gives essentially the same geometric objects as those considered by other recent authors.

We could have taken a different approach: we could instead have defined a 2-category of orbifolds $\mathbf{Orb}$ following one of the routes in [25, 28, 35] or elsewhere, and then defined an embedding 2-functor $F_{\mathbf{Orb}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}} : \mathbf{Orb} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ and shown it was fully faithful, as we did for $F_{\mathbf{Man}}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}} : \mathbf{Man} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$. We chose not to do this because as above there are several competing ways to construct $\mathbf{Orb}$ as a 2-category, and all are rather complicated, so having already set up a theory of C^∞ -stacks, this was the fastest way to our goal.

From §8.6 an orbifold $\mathcal{X}$ has an *underlying topological space* $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, which is Hausdorff by Lemma 8.29, and each $[x] \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$ has an orbifold group $\text{Iso}([x])$, which is a finite group. Also by Theorem 8.36 $\mathcal{X}$ has a *coarse moduli C^∞ -scheme* $\underline{X}$, with underlying topological space $\mathcal{X}_{\text{top}}$, and $\underline{X}$ is locally finitely presented if $\mathcal{X}$ is without boundary, and locally good if $\mathcal{X}$ has boundary or corners.

By Corollary 4.14 $F_{\mathbf{Man}^c}^{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}$ takes transverse fibre products in $\mathbf{Man}, \mathbf{Man}^c$ to fibre products in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$. As fibre products of orbifolds are locally modelled on fibre products of manifolds, and fibre products of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks are locally modelled on fibre products of C^∞ -schemes, we deduce:

Corollary 8.40. *Transverse fibre products in $\mathbf{Orb}, \mathbf{Orb}^c$ involving smooth*

rather than weakly smooth 1-morphisms agree with the corresponding fibre products in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$.

The next example illustrates the 2-categorical nature of orbifolds.

Example 8.41. Write $\underline{*} = \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{R}$ for the point in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, and $\bar{*}$ for its image in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$. Let H be a nontrivial finite group. Then H acts trivially on $\underline{*}$, so we can form the quotient C^∞ -stack $[\underline{*}/H]$. Both $\bar{*}$ and $[\underline{*}/H]$ are orbifolds, points with stabilizer groups $\{1\}$ and H . There is a unique 1-morphism $i : \bar{*} \rightarrow [\underline{*}/H]$ corresponding to the group morphism $\{1\} \rightarrow H$. For any C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ there is a unique 1-morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \bar{*}$, as $\bar{*}$ is a terminal object in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$.

Consider the fibre product $\bar{*} \times_{i, [\underline{*}/H], i} \bar{*}$. In Proposition 8.20 we have $\underline{X} = \underline{Y} = \underline{Z} = \underline{*}$, $F = G = \{1\}$, and $\underline{W} = \underline{H}$. Thus we have a 2-Cartesian diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{H} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \bar{*} \\ \pi \downarrow & \eta \nearrow & \downarrow i \\ \bar{*} & \xrightarrow{i} & [\underline{*}/H]. \end{array} \quad (58)$$

That is, $\bar{*} \times_{i, [\underline{*}/H], i} \bar{*}$ is the disjoint union of $|H|$ copies of the point $\bar{*}$.

Observe that (58) only makes sense if orbifolds are a 2-category, not a 1-category. If we regard orbifolds as a 1-category, via the homotopy 1-category $\mathbf{Orb}^{\mathrm{ho}}$ of Theorem 8.39, then the 1-category fibre product $\bar{*} \times_{i, [\underline{*}/H], i} \bar{*}$ in $\mathbf{Orb}^{\mathrm{ho}}$ would be one point, not $|H|$ points. All the nontrivial information in (58) is encoded in the 2-morphism η . Although there is only one 1-morphism $i : \bar{*} \rightarrow [\underline{*}/H]$, there are $|H|$ different 2-morphisms $\zeta : i \Rightarrow i$, which correspond to the elements of H . In (58) the 1-morphism $i \circ \pi : H \rightarrow [\underline{*}/H]$ is the disjoint union of $|H|$ copies of $i : \bar{*} \rightarrow [\underline{*}/H]$, and 2-morphism $\eta : i \circ \pi \Rightarrow i \circ \pi$ is the disjoint union of the $|H|$ different 2-morphisms $\zeta : i \Rightarrow i$.

This example illustrates the fact that the underlying topological space functor $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathrm{Top}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ from §8.6 may not preserve fibre products, since the fibre product $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathrm{Top}}(\bar{*}) \times_{F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathrm{Top}}([\underline{*}/H])} F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}}^{\mathrm{Top}}(\bar{*})$ is one point, not $|H|$ points. In contrast, the corresponding functor $F_{\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}}^{\mathrm{Top}} : \mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ on C^∞ -schemes does preserve fibre products.

9 Sheaves on Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks

Finally we discuss sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules, quasicoherent sheaves, and coherent sheaves on Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks $\mathcal{X}$, generalizing §6 for C^∞ -schemes. Some references on sheaves on orbifolds or stacks are Behrend and Xu [4, §3.1], Deligne and Mumford [8, Def. 4.10], Heinloth [18, §4], Laumon and Moret-Bailly [24, §13], and Moerdijk and Pronk [30, §2]. Our definition of sheaves on C^∞ -stacks is closest to [18, 30].

9.1 $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules, quasicoherent and coherent sheaves

We build our notions of sheaves on Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks from those of sheaves on C^∞ -schemes in §6, by lifting to étale covers.

Definition 9.1. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Define a category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ to have objects pairs $(\underline{U}, u)$ where $\underline{U}$ is a C^∞ -scheme and $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an étale morphism, and morphisms $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{V}, v)$ where $\underline{f} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ is an étale morphism of C^∞ -schemes, and $\eta : u \Rightarrow v \circ \underline{f}$ is a 2-isomorphism. (Here $\underline{f}$ étale is implied by u, v étale and $u \cong v \circ \underline{f}$.) If $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{V}, v)$ and $(\underline{g}, \zeta) : (\underline{V}, v) \rightarrow (\underline{W}, w)$ are morphisms in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ then we define the composition $(\underline{g}, \zeta) \circ (\underline{f}, \eta)$ to be $(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f}, \theta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{W}, w)$, where θ is the composition of 2-morphisms across the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \underline{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad \underline{f} \quad} & \underline{V} \\
 \downarrow \underline{g \circ f} & \swarrow \text{id} & \downarrow \underline{g} \\
 \underline{W} & & \underline{V}
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \xrightarrow{u} & & \xrightarrow{v} \\
 \searrow \eta & & \searrow \zeta \\
 & \xrightarrow{w} &
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \mathcal{X}
 \end{array}$$

Define a *sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules* $\mathcal{E}$, or just an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -module $\mathcal{E}$, to assign a sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules $\mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u)$ on $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$ for all objects $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules $\mathcal{E}_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} : \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, v)) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u)$ for all morphisms $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{V}, v)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, such that for all $(\underline{f}, \eta), (\underline{g}, \zeta), (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f}, \theta)$ as above the following diagram of isomorphisms of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{W}, w)) & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathcal{E}_{(\underline{g} \circ \underline{f}, \theta)} \quad} & \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u), \\
 \downarrow I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(\mathcal{E}(\underline{W}, w)) & \searrow \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{W}, w)) & \xrightarrow{\quad \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}_{(\underline{g}, \zeta)}) \quad} \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, v)) \xrightarrow{\quad \mathcal{E}_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} \quad} \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u)
 \end{array}
 \quad (59)$$

for $I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(\mathcal{E})$ as in Remark 6.4.

A *morphism of sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules* $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ assigns a morphism of $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules $\phi(\underline{U}, u) : \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\underline{U}, u)$ for each object $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, such that for all morphisms $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{V}, v)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ the following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, v)) & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathcal{E}_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} \quad} & \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u) \\
 \downarrow \underline{f}^*(\phi(\underline{V}, v)) & & \downarrow \phi(\underline{U}, u) \\
 \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{F}(\underline{V}, v)) & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathcal{F}_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} \quad} & \mathcal{F}(\underline{U}, u).
 \end{array}$$

We call $\mathcal{E}$ *quasicoherent*, or *coherent*, or a *vector bundle of rank n* , if $\mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u)$ is quasicoherent, or coherent, or a vector bundle of rank n , respectively, for all $(\underline{U}, u) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Write $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ for the category of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules, and $\text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X})$, $\text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$ for the full subcategories of quasicoherent and coherent sheaves.

Remark 9.2. (a) Here is a second, different way to define $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules, closer to [4, §3.1], [8, Def. 4.10]. Define a Grothendieck topology $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}}$ on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ to have coverings $\{(\underline{i}_a, \eta_a) : (\underline{U}_a, u_a) \rightarrow (\underline{U}, u)\}_{a \in A}$ where $\underline{i}_a : \underline{U}_a \rightarrow \underline{U}$ is an open embedding for all $a \in A$ and $U = \bigcup_{a \in A} i_a(U_a)$. Then $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is a site.

We can now use the standard notion of *sheaves on a site*, as in Artin [2] or Metzler [28, §2.1]. For all $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, define a C^∞ -ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(\underline{U}, u) = \mathcal{O}_U(U)$,

where $\underline{U} = (U, \mathcal{O}_U)$. For all morphisms $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{V}, v) \rightarrow (\underline{U}, u)$, define a morphism of C^∞ -rings $\rho_{(\underline{U}, u)(\underline{V}, v)} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(\underline{V}, v)$ by $\rho_{(\underline{U}, u)(\underline{V}, v)} = f^\sharp(U) : \mathcal{O}_U(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_V(V)$. Then $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a *sheaf of C^∞ -rings on the site $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}})$* .

Define a *sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules $\mathcal{E}'$* to be a sheaf of modules of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ on $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{X}})$. That is, $\mathcal{E}'$ assigns an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}(\underline{U}, u)$ -module $\mathcal{E}'(\underline{U}, u)$ for all $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and a linear map $\mathcal{E}'_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} : \mathcal{E}'(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}'(\underline{V}, v)$ for all $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{V}, v) \rightarrow (\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, such that the analogue of (28) commutes, and the usual axioms for sheaves on a site hold.

If $\mathcal{E}$ is as in Definition 9.1 then defining $\mathcal{E}'(\underline{U}, u) = \Gamma(\mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u))$ gives an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -module in the sense of this second definition. Conversely, any $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -module in this second sense extends to one in the first sense uniquely up to canonical isomorphism. Thus the two definitions yield equivalent categories.

(b) As $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules are a kind of sheaves of sets on a site, not sheaves of categories on a site as stacks are, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ is a category not a 2-category.

(c) If $\mathcal{X}$ is locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented, then $\underline{U}$ is also locally fair, or locally good, or locally finitely presented, for all $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$, since $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is étale.

(d) In Definition 9.1 we require the 1-morphisms u, v, w and morphisms $\underline{f}, \underline{g}$ to be *étale*. This is important in several places below: for instance, if $\underline{f} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ is étale then $\underline{f}^* : \mathcal{O}_V\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_U\text{-mod}$ is exact, not just right exact, which is needed to show $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ is abelian, and also $\Omega_{\underline{f}} : \underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{V}) \rightarrow T^*\underline{U}$ is an isomorphism, which is needed to define the cotangent sheaf $T^*\mathcal{X}$. We restricted to *Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks $\mathcal{X}$* in order to be able to use étale (1-)morphisms in this way. For C^∞ -stacks $\mathcal{X}$ which do not admit an étale atlas, the approach above is inadequate and would need to be modified.

(e) Our notion of vector bundles $\mathcal{E}$ over $\mathcal{X}$ correspond to *orbifold vector bundles* when $\mathcal{X}$ is an orbifold. That is, the stabilizer groups $\text{Iso}([x])$ of $\mathcal{X}$ are allowed to act nontrivially on the vector space fibres $\mathcal{E}|_x$ of $\mathcal{E}$.

Now $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ is an *abelian category*, where $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ if and only if $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u) \xrightarrow{\phi(\underline{U}, u)} \mathcal{F}(\underline{U}, u) \xrightarrow{\psi(\underline{U}, u)} \mathcal{G}(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_U\text{-mod}$ for all $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$. To prove this, note that each $\mathcal{O}_U\text{-mod}$ in Definition 9.1 is abelian, and the functors $\underline{f}^*$ are exact (not just right exact) as $\underline{f}$ is étale. Thus Corollary 6.11 and Proposition 6.12 imply:

Proposition 9.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Then $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ is an abelian category, and $\text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under kernels, cokernels and extensions in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$, so it is also an abelian category. Also $\text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under cokernels and extensions in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$, but it may not be closed under kernels in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$, so may not be abelian. If $\mathcal{X}$ is locally fair then $\text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$.*

Example 9.4. Let $\underline{X}$ be a C^∞ -scheme. Then $\mathcal{X} = \bar{\underline{X}}$ is a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. We will define an inclusion functor $\mathcal{I}_{\underline{X}} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ which induces equivalences between the categories $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}, \text{qcoh}(\underline{X}), \text{coh}(\underline{X})$ defined in §6 and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}, \text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X}), \text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$ above. This shows that our notions of sheaves for C^∞ -stacks are good generalizations of those for C^∞ -schemes in §6.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an object in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$. If $(\underline{U}, u)$ is an object in $\mathcal{C}_X$ then $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} = \underline{X}$ is a 1-morphism, so as $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$ are equivalent (2-)categories u is 1-isomorphic to $\underline{u} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{X}$ for some unique morphism $\underline{u} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{X}$. Define $\mathcal{E}'(\underline{U}, u) = \underline{u}^*(\mathcal{E})$. If $(f, \eta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{V}, v)$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{C}_X$ and $\underline{u}, \underline{v}$ are associated to u, v as above, so that $\underline{u} = \underline{v} \circ f$, then define

$$\mathcal{E}'_{(f, \eta)} = I_{\underline{f}, \underline{v}}(\mathcal{E})^{-1} : \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}'(\underline{V}, v)) = \underline{f}^*(\underline{v}^*(\mathcal{E})) \rightarrow (\underline{v} \circ \underline{f})^*(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}'(\underline{U}, u).$$

Then (59) commutes for all $(f, \eta), (g, \zeta)$, so $\mathcal{E}'$ is an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module.

If $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a morphism of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules then we define a morphism $\phi' : \mathcal{E}' \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$ in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ by $\phi'(\underline{U}, u) = \underline{u}^*(\phi)$ for $\underline{u}$ associated to u as above. Then defining $\mathcal{I}_X : \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathcal{E}'$, $\mathcal{I}_X : \phi \mapsto \phi'$ gives a functor $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$. There is a natural inverse construction: if $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is an object in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ then $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\underline{X}, \text{id}_X)$ is an object in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathcal{I}_X(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}(\underline{X}, \text{id}_X))$. Using this we can show $\mathcal{I}_X$ is an equivalence of categories.

9.2 Writing sheaves in terms of a groupoid presentation

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Then $\mathcal{X}$ admits an étale atlas $\Pi : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, and as in §7.5 from Π we can construct a groupoid $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, s, t, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, with $s, t : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U}$ étale, such that $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to the groupoid stack $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$, and we have a 2-Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{V} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \underline{U} \\ \bar{s} \downarrow & \eta \nearrow & \downarrow \Pi \\ \underline{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{X}. \end{array}$$

We can now consider the objects $(\underline{U}, \Pi)$ and $(\underline{V}, \Pi \circ s)$ in $\mathcal{C}_X$, and the two morphisms $(s, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ s}) : (\underline{V}, \Pi \circ s) \rightarrow (\underline{U}, \Pi)$ and $(t, \eta) : (\underline{V}, \Pi \circ s) \rightarrow (\underline{U}, \Pi)$.

Now let $\mathcal{E}$ be an object in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$. Then we have an $\mathcal{O}_U$ -module $E = \mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, \Pi)$, an $\mathcal{O}_V$ -module $E' = \mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, \Pi \circ s)$, and isomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_V$ -modules $\mathcal{E}_{(s, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ s})} : s^*(E) \rightarrow E'$ and $\mathcal{E}_{(t, \eta)} : t^*(E) \rightarrow E'$. Hence $\Phi = \mathcal{E}_{(t, \eta)}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}_{(s, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ s})}$ is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_V$ -modules $\Phi : s^*(E) \rightarrow t^*(E)$.

We also have a 2-commutative diagram with all squares 2-Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \bar{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{m} \quad} & \bar{V} & \\ \bar{\pi}_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \bar{\pi}_2 & & \swarrow \bar{s} \\ \bar{V} & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{t} \quad} & \bar{U} & \xleftarrow{\quad \bar{i} \quad} & \bar{V} \\ & \searrow \bar{s} & \swarrow \bar{t} & \searrow \bar{s} & \\ & \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad \bar{i} \quad} & \bar{V} & \\ & & \searrow \bar{\pi}_1 & & \swarrow \bar{s} \\ & & & \mathcal{X} & \end{array}$$

omitting 2-morphisms, where $\bar{W} = \underline{V} \times_{\bar{s}, \bar{U}, \bar{t}} \bar{V}$, and $\bar{\pi}_1, \bar{\pi}_2 : \bar{W} \rightarrow \bar{V}$ are projections to the first and second factors in the fibre product. So we have an object $(\bar{W}, \Pi \circ \bar{s} \circ \bar{\pi}_1)$ in $\mathcal{C}_X$, and we can define $E'' = \mathcal{E}(\bar{W}, \Pi \circ \bar{s} \circ \bar{\pi}_1)$. Then we have

a commutative diagram of isomorphisms in $\mathcal{O}_W\text{-mod}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & E'' & \xleftarrow{\mathcal{E}(\underline{m}, \theta_3)} & \underline{m}^*(E') \\
& \nearrow \mathcal{E}(\underline{x}_1, \theta_1) & \nwarrow \mathcal{E}(\underline{x}_2, \theta_2) & & \nwarrow \underline{m}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{s}, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ \underline{s}})) \\
\pi_1^*(E') & \xleftarrow{\pi_1^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{t}, \eta)) \circ I_{\pi_1, \underline{t}}(E)} & & \xleftarrow{\underline{m}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{t}, \eta)) \circ I_{\underline{m}, \underline{t}}(E)} & \underline{m}^*(E') \\
& \nwarrow \pi_1^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{s}, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ \underline{s}})) \circ I_{\pi_1, \underline{s}}(E) & \nearrow \pi_2^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{t}, \eta)) \circ I_{\pi_2, \underline{t}}(E) & \nwarrow \pi_2^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{s}, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ \underline{s}})) \circ I_{\pi_2, \underline{s}}(E) & \nwarrow (\underline{s} \circ \underline{m})^*(E) \\
& & \pi_2^*(E') & \xleftarrow{\pi_2^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{s}, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ \underline{s}})) \circ I_{\pi_2, \underline{s}}(E)} & (\underline{s} \circ \underline{m})^*(E) \\
& & & \nwarrow \beta & \\
& & & & (\underline{s} \circ \underline{m})^*(E)
\end{array}
\quad (60)$$

Here the morphisms ‘ $\dashrightarrow$ ’ are given by $\alpha = I_{\underline{m}, \underline{t}}(E)^{-1} \circ \underline{m}^*(\Phi) \circ I_{\underline{m}, \underline{s}}(E)$, $\beta = I_{\pi_2, \underline{t}}(E)^{-1} \circ \pi_2^*(\Phi) \circ I_{\pi_2, \underline{s}}(E)$ and $\gamma = I_{\pi_1, \underline{t}}(E)^{-1} \circ \pi_1^*(\Phi) \circ I_{\pi_1, \underline{s}}(E)$, and as (60) commutes we have $\alpha = \gamma \circ \beta$. This motivates:

Definition 9.5. Let $(\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{s}, \underline{t}, \underline{u}, \underline{i}, \underline{m})$ be a groupoid in $\mathbf{C}^\infty\mathbf{Sch}$, with $\underline{s}, \underline{t} : \underline{V} \rightarrow \underline{U}$ étale, which we write as $\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}$ for short. Define a $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$ -module to be a pair (E, Φ) where E is an $\mathcal{O}_U$ -module and $\Phi : \underline{s}^*(E) \rightarrow \underline{t}^*(E)$ is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_V$ -modules, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\underline{m}, \underline{t}}(E)^{-1} \circ \underline{m}^*(\Phi) \circ I_{\underline{m}, \underline{s}}(E) &= (I_{\pi_1, \underline{t}}(E)^{-1} \circ \pi_1^*(\Phi) \circ I_{\pi_1, \underline{s}}(E)) \circ \\
&\quad (I_{\pi_2, \underline{t}}(E)^{-1} \circ \pi_2^*(\Phi) \circ I_{\pi_2, \underline{s}}(E))
\end{aligned}
\quad (61)$$

in morphisms of $\mathcal{O}_W$ -modules $(\underline{s} \circ \underline{m})^*(E) \rightarrow (\underline{t} \circ \underline{m})^*(E)$. Define a *morphism of $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$ -modules* $\phi : (E, \Phi) \rightarrow (F, \Psi)$ to be a morphism of $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules $\phi : E \rightarrow F$ such that $\Psi \circ \underline{s}^*(\phi) = \underline{t}^*(\phi) \circ \Phi : \underline{s}^*(E) \rightarrow \underline{t}^*(F)$. Then $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$ -modules form an *abelian category* $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})\text{-mod}$. The construction above shows that if $\mathcal{X}$ is a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack equivalent to $[\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U}]$ with atlas $\Pi : \underline{\bar{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ then we have a *functor* $F_\Pi : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod} \rightarrow (\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})\text{-mod}$ defined by $F_\Pi : \mathcal{E} \mapsto (\mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, \Pi), \mathcal{E}_{(\underline{t}, \eta)}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}_{(\underline{s}, \text{id}_{\Pi \circ \underline{s}})})$ and $F_\Pi : \phi \mapsto \phi(\underline{U}, \Pi)$.

Define $\text{qcoh}(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$ and $\text{coh}(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$ to be the full subcategories of (E, Φ) in $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})\text{-mod}$ with E quasicoherent, or coherent, respectively.

Theorem 9.6. *The functor F_Π above induces equivalences between $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$, $\text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X})$, $\text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$ and $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})\text{-mod}$, $\text{qcoh}(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$, $\text{coh}(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$, respectively.*

Proof. Let (E, Φ) be an object in $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})\text{-mod}$. We will construct an object $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ with $F_\Pi(\mathcal{E}) = (E, \Phi)$, and show $\mathcal{E}$ is unique up to canonical isomorphism. This defines an inverse for F_Π up to natural isomorphism, and so shows $F_\Pi : \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod} \rightarrow (\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})\text{-mod}$ is an equivalence. The quasicoherent and coherent sheaf cases are then immediate.

Suppose $(\underline{Y}, y)$ is an object in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$. We will construct an $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module $\mathcal{E}(\underline{Y}, y)$, uniquely up to isomorphism. Now $y : \underline{\bar{Y}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a 1-morphism, and $\Pi : \underline{\bar{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is a surjective 1-morphism. Therefore by Definition 7.14 there exists an open cover $\{\underline{Y}_a : a \in A\}$ of $\underline{Y}$ with inclusions $\underline{i}_{Y_a} : \underline{Y}_a \hookrightarrow \underline{Y}$ and 1-morphisms $\underline{f}_a : \underline{Y}_a \rightarrow \underline{U}$ such that $y \circ \underline{i}_{Y_a}$ is 2-isomorphic to $\Pi \circ \underline{f}_a$ as 1-morphisms $\underline{\bar{Y}}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, for all $a \in A$. Also $\underline{f}_a$ is étale as $\Pi, y, \underline{i}_{Y_a}$ are.

Thus we have an $\mathcal{O}_{Y_a}$ -module $f_a^*(E)$ on Y_a for $a \in A$. Using Φ we can construct natural isomorphisms $\pi_{Y_a}^*(f_a^*(E)) \cong \pi_{Y_b}^*(f_b^*(E))$ of modules on the intersection/fibre product $Y_a \cap Y_b = Y_{ab} = Y_a \times_{i_{Y_a}, Y, i_{Y_b}} Y_b$ for $a, b \in A$. Using (61) and the groupoid axioms we can show that these isomorphisms satisfy the natural compatibility condition on triple overlaps $Y_a \cap Y_b \cap Y_c$ for $a, b, c \in A$. Therefore by a version of descent for objects for $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules on C^∞ -schemes Y , there exists an $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module $\mathcal{E}(Y, y)$, unique up to canonical isomorphism, with isomorphisms $i_{Y_a}^*(\mathcal{E}(Y, y)) \cong f_a^*(E)$ of $\mathcal{O}_{Y_a}$ -modules for all $a \in A$.

This allows us to construct $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules $\mathcal{E}(Y, y)$ for all (Y, y) in $\mathcal{C}_X$, up to canonical isomorphism. When $(Y, y) = (\underline{U}, \Pi)$ we choose $\mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, \Pi) = E$. Having chosen such $\mathcal{E}(Y, y)$ for all (Y, y) , a version of descent for morphisms for $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules on C^∞ -schemes Y gives us unique isomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules $\mathcal{E}_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} : \underline{f}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{Z}, z)) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(Y, y)$ for all morphisms $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (Y, y) \rightarrow (Z, z)$ in $\mathcal{C}_X$, constructed using compatible open covers for Y, Z and morphisms from them to $\underline{U}$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module with $F_\Pi(\mathcal{E}) = (E, \Phi)$. Uniqueness of $\mathcal{E}(Y, y)$ up to canonical isomorphism and of $\mathcal{E}_{(\underline{f}, \eta)}$ above implies that $\mathcal{E}$ is unique up to canonical isomorphism. $\square$

For quotient C^∞ -stacks $[\underline{U}/G]$ with G a finite group, so that $\underline{V} = G \times \underline{U}$, a $(\underline{V} \rightrightarrows \underline{U})$ -module (E, Φ) is an $\mathcal{O}_U$ -module E with a lift Φ of the G -action on $\underline{U}$ up to E . That is, (E, Φ) is a G -equivariant $\mathcal{O}_U$ -module. Hence, if a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack $\mathcal{X}$ is equivalent to a quotient $[\underline{U}/G]$ with G finite, then $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}, \text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X}), \text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$ are equivalent to the abelian categories of G -equivariant $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules, quasicoherent and coherent sheaves on $\underline{U}$.

Example 9.7. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the quotient stack $[\underline{*}/G]$, where $\underline{*} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{R}$ is a point and G is a finite group. Then $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod} = \text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X})$ is equivalent to the abelian category of all G -representations over $\mathbb{R}$, and $\text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$ is equivalent to the abelian category of finite-dimensional G -representations over $\mathbb{R}$.

9.3 Pullback of sheaves as a pseudofunctor

In Definition 6.3, for a morphism of C^∞ -schemes $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ we defined a right exact functor $\underline{f}^* : \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$. As in Remark 6.4, pullbacks cannot always be made strictly functorial in $\underline{f}$, that is, we do not have $\underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(\mathcal{E})) = (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\underline{f} : \underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y}, \underline{g} : \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Z}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Z\text{-mod}$, but instead we have canonical isomorphisms $I_{\underline{f}, \underline{g}}(\mathcal{E}) : (\underline{g} \circ \underline{f})^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \underline{f}^*(\underline{g}^*(\mathcal{E}))$.

We now generalize this to pullback for sheaves on Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks. The new factor to consider is that we have not only 1-morphisms $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, but also 2-morphisms $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$ for 1-morphisms $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, and we must interpret pullback for 2-morphisms as well as 1-morphisms.

Definition 9.8. Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a 1-morphism of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks, and $\mathcal{F}$ be an $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module. A *pullback* of $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{X}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $\mathcal{E}$, together with the following data: if $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ are C^∞ -schemes and $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ are étale 1-morphisms, then there is a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{W}$ and morphisms

$\pi_{\underline{U}} : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{U}$, $\pi_{\underline{V}} : \underline{W} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ giving a 2-Cartesian diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \underline{V} \\ \pi_{\underline{U}} \downarrow & \nearrow \zeta & \downarrow v \\ \underline{U} & \xrightarrow{\quad f \circ u \quad} & \mathcal{Y}. \end{array} \quad (62)$$

Then an isomorphism $i(\mathcal{F}, f, u, v, \zeta) : \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{U}, u)) \rightarrow \pi_{\underline{V}}^*(\mathcal{F}(\underline{V}, v))$ of $\mathcal{O}_W$ -modules should be given, which is functorial in $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $(\underline{V}, v)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ and the 2-isomorphism ζ in (62). We usually write pullbacks $\mathcal{E}$ as $f^*(\mathcal{F})$.

By a similar proof to Theorem 9.6, but using descent for objects and morphisms for $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules on C^∞ -schemes $\underline{Y}$ in the étale topology rather than the open cover topology on $\underline{Y}$, we can prove:

Proposition 9.9. *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a 1-morphism of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks, and $\mathcal{F}$ be an $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module. Then a pullback $f^*(\mathcal{F})$ exists in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$, and is unique up to canonical isomorphism.*

From now on we will assume that we have *chosen* a pullback $f^*(\mathcal{F})$ for all such $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. This could be done either by some explicit construction of pullbacks, as in the C^∞ -scheme case in §6.1, or by using the Axiom of Choice. As in Remark 6.4 we cannot necessarily make these choices functorial in f .

Definition 9.10. Choose pullbacks $f^*(\mathcal{F})$ for all 1-morphisms $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks and all $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$, as above.

Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be such a 1-morphism, and $\phi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$. Then $f^*(\mathcal{E}), f^*(\mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$. Define the *pullback morphism* $f^*(\phi) : f^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow f^*(\mathcal{F})$ to be the morphism in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$ characterized as follows. Let $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, $\underline{W}, \pi_{\underline{U}}, \pi_{\underline{V}}$ be as in Definition 9.8, with (62) Cartesian. Then the following diagram of morphisms of $\mathcal{O}_W$ -modules commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(f^*(\mathcal{E})(\underline{U}, u)) & \xrightarrow{\quad i(\mathcal{E}, f, u, v, \zeta) \quad} & \pi_{\underline{V}}^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, v)) \\ \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(f^*(\phi)(\underline{U}, u)) \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_{\underline{V}}^*(\phi(\underline{V}, v)) \\ \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(f^*(\mathcal{F})(\underline{U}, u)) & \xrightarrow{\quad i(\mathcal{F}, f, u, v, \zeta) \quad} & \pi_{\underline{V}}^*(\mathcal{F}(\underline{V}, v)). \end{array}$$

Using descent for morphisms for $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules on C^∞ -schemes $\underline{Y}$ in the étale topology, one can show that there is a unique morphism $f^*(\phi)$ with this property.

This now defines a *functor* $f^* : \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$. By the last part of Proposition 6.12, f^* also maps $\text{qcoh}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \text{qcoh}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\text{coh}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \text{coh}(\mathcal{X})$.

Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be 1-morphisms of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks, and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Z\text{-mod}$. Then $(g \circ f)^*(\mathcal{E})$ and $f^*(g^*(\mathcal{E}))$ both lie in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}\text{-mod}$. One can show that $f^*(g^*(\mathcal{E}))$ is a possible pullback of $\mathcal{E}$ by $g \circ f$. Thus as in Remark 6.4, we have a canonical isomorphism $I_{f,g}(\mathcal{E}) : (g \circ f)^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow f^*(g^*(\mathcal{E}))$. This defines a natural isomorphism of functors $I_{f,g} : (g \circ f)^* \Rightarrow f^* \circ g^*$.

Let $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be 1-morphisms of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks, $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$ a 2-morphism, and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$. Then we have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -modules $f^*(\mathcal{E}), g^*(\mathcal{E})$. Let

$u : \bar{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \bar{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, $\bar{W}, \pi_{\bar{U}}, \pi_{\bar{V}}$ be as in Definition 9.8. Then as in (62) we have 2-Cartesian diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bar{V} \\ \pi_{\bar{U}} \downarrow & \zeta \odot (\eta * \text{id}_{u \circ \pi_{\bar{U}}}) \nearrow & \downarrow v \\ \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{f \circ u} & \mathcal{Y}, \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bar{V} \\ \pi_{\bar{U}} \downarrow & \zeta \nearrow & \downarrow v \\ \bar{U} & \xrightarrow{g \circ u} & \mathcal{Y}, \end{array}$$

where in $\zeta \odot (\eta * \text{id}_{u \circ \pi_{\bar{U}}})$ ‘ $*$ ’ is horizontal composition and ‘ $\odot$ ’ vertical composition of 2-morphisms. Thus we have isomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_W$ -modules:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_{\bar{U}}^*(f^*(\mathcal{E})(\bar{U}, u)) & \xrightarrow{i(\mathcal{E}, f, u, v, \zeta \odot (\eta * \text{id}_{u \circ \pi_{\bar{U}}}))} & \pi_{\bar{V}}^*(\mathcal{E}(\bar{V}, v)). \\ \vdots \downarrow & & \\ \pi_{\bar{U}}^*(g^*(\mathcal{E})(\bar{U}, u)) & \xrightarrow{i(\mathcal{E}, g, u, v, \zeta)} & \end{array}$$

There is a unique isomorphism ‘ $\dashrightarrow$ ’ making this diagram commute. Taken over all $(\bar{V}, v)$, using descent for morphisms we can show these isomorphisms are pullbacks of a unique isomorphism $f^*(\mathcal{E})(\bar{U}, u) \rightarrow g^*(\mathcal{E})(\bar{U}, u)$, and taken over all $(\bar{U}, u)$ these give an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules $\eta^*(\mathcal{E}) : f^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow g^*(\mathcal{E})$. Over all $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$, this defines a natural isomorphism $\eta^* : f^* \Rightarrow g^*$.

If $\mathcal{X}$ is a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack with identity 1-morphism $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ then for each $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, $\mathcal{E}$ is a possible pullback $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}^*(\mathcal{E})$, so we have a canonical isomorphism $\delta_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{E}) : \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$. These define a natural isomorphism $\delta_{\mathcal{X}} : \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}^* \Rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}}$.

The proof of the next theorem is long but straightforward. For *pseudofunctors* see Borceux [5, §7.5] or Behrend et al. [3, §B.4].

Theorem 9.11. *Mapping $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ for objects $\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, and mapping 1-morphisms $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ to $f^* : \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$, and mapping 2-morphisms $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$ to $\eta^* : f^* \Rightarrow g^*$ for 1-morphisms $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, and the natural isomorphisms $I_{f,g} : (g \circ f)^* \Rightarrow f^* \circ g^*$ for all 1-morphisms $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, and $\delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ for all $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, together make up a **pseudofunctor** $(\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{AbCat}$, where $\mathbf{AbCat}$ is the 2-category of abelian categories. That is, they satisfy the conditions:*

- (a) *If $f : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, $h : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ are 1-morphisms in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Z\text{-mod}$ then the following diagram commutes in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (h \circ g \circ f)^*(\mathcal{E}) & \xrightarrow{I_{f, h \circ g}(\mathcal{E})} & f^*((h \circ g)^*(\mathcal{E})) \\ I_{g \circ f, h}(\mathcal{E}) \downarrow & & \downarrow f^*(I_{g, h}(\mathcal{E})) \\ (g \circ f)^*(h^*(\mathcal{E})) & \xrightarrow{I_{f, g}(h^*(\mathcal{E}))} & f^*(g^*(h^*(\mathcal{E}))). \end{array}$$

- (b) *If $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a 1-morphism in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_Y\text{-mod}$ then the following pairs of morphisms in $\mathcal{O}_X\text{-mod}$ are inverse:*

$$f^*(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{I_{\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}, f}(\mathcal{E})}{\delta_{\mathcal{X}}(f^*(\mathcal{E}))} \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}^*(f^*(\mathcal{E})), \quad f^*(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{I_{f, \text{id}_{\mathcal{Y}}}(\mathcal{E})}{f^*(\delta_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{E}))} f^*(\text{id}_{\mathcal{Y}}^*(\mathcal{E})).$$

Also $(\mathrm{id}_f)^*(\mathrm{id}_\mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{id}_{f^*(\mathcal{E})} : f^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow f^*(\mathcal{E})$.

- (c) If $f, g, h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ are 1-morphisms and $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$, $\zeta : g \Rightarrow h$ are 2-morphisms in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, so that $\zeta \odot \eta : f \Rightarrow h$ is the vertical composition, and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Y}\text{-mod}$, then

$$\zeta^*(\mathcal{F}) \circ \eta^*(\mathcal{E}) = (\zeta \odot \eta)^*(\mathcal{E}) : f^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow h^*(\mathcal{E}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}\text{-mod}.$$

- (d) If $f, \tilde{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, $g, \tilde{g} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ are 1-morphisms and $\eta : f \Rightarrow f'$, $\zeta : g \Rightarrow g'$ 2-morphisms in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty\mathbf{Sta}$, so that $\zeta * \eta : g \circ f \Rightarrow g' \circ f'$ is the horizontal composition, and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Z}\text{-mod}$, then the following commutes in $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}\text{-mod}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (g \circ f)^*(\mathcal{E}) & \xrightarrow{(\zeta * \eta)^*(\mathcal{E})} & (\tilde{g} \circ \tilde{f})^*(\mathcal{E}) \\ I_{f,g}(\mathcal{E}) \downarrow & \xrightarrow{\eta^*(g^*(\mathcal{E}))} & \tilde{f}^*(\zeta^*(\mathcal{E})) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}^*(\zeta^*(\mathcal{E}))} & \tilde{f}^*(\tilde{g}^*(\mathcal{E})) \\ f^*(g^*(\mathcal{E})) & \xrightarrow{\eta^*(g^*(\mathcal{E}))} & \tilde{f}^*(g^*(\mathcal{E})) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}^*(\zeta^*(\mathcal{E}))} & \tilde{f}^*(\tilde{g}^*(\mathcal{E})). \end{array}$$

Here is the analogue of Proposition 6.5.

Proposition 9.12. *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a 1-morphism of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks. Then pullback $f^* : \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Y}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}\text{-mod}$ is a right exact functor.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Y}\text{-mod}$. Let $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, $\underline{W}$, $\underline{\pi}_U$, $\underline{\pi}_V$ be as in Definition 9.8. Then $\mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, v) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\underline{V}, v) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\underline{V}, v) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_V\text{-mod}$, so $\underline{\pi}_V^*(\mathcal{E}(\underline{V}, v)) \rightarrow \underline{\pi}_V^*(\mathcal{F}(\underline{V}, v)) \rightarrow \underline{\pi}_V^*(\mathcal{G}(\underline{V}, v)) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_W\text{-mod}$ by Proposition 6.5. Thus by the isomorphisms $i(-, f, u, v, \zeta)$, $\underline{\pi}_U^*(f^*(\mathcal{E})(\underline{U}, u)) \rightarrow \underline{\pi}_U^*(f^*(\mathcal{F})(\underline{U}, u)) \rightarrow \underline{\pi}_U^*(f^*(\mathcal{G})(\underline{U}, u)) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_U\text{-mod}$. As this is true for all $(\underline{V}, v)$ we see that $f^*(\mathcal{E})(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow f^*(\mathcal{F})(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow f^*(\mathcal{G})(\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_U\text{-mod}$. Since this holds for all $(\underline{U}, u)$ we see that $f^*(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow f^*(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow f^*(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow 0$ is exact in $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}\text{-mod}$, as we have to prove. $\square$

9.4 Cotangent sheaves of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks

We now develop the analogue of the ideas of §6.4.

Definition 9.13. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. Define an $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}$ -module $T^*\mathcal{X}$ called the *cotangent sheaf* of $\mathcal{X}$ by $(T^*\mathcal{X})(\underline{U}, u) = T^*\underline{U}$ for all objects $(\underline{U}, u)$ in $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}$ and $(T^*\mathcal{X})_{(\underline{f}, \eta)} = \Omega_{\underline{f}} : \underline{f}^*(T^*\underline{V}) \rightarrow T^*\underline{U}$ for all morphisms $(\underline{f}, \eta) : (\underline{U}, u) \rightarrow (\underline{V}, v)$ in $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{X}$, where $T^*\underline{U}$ and $\Omega_{\underline{f}}$ are as in §6.4. Here as $\underline{f} : \underline{U} \rightarrow \underline{V}$ is étale $\Omega_{\underline{f}}$ is an isomorphism, so $(T^*\mathcal{X})_{(\underline{f}, \eta)}$ is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules as required. Also Theorem 6.17(a) shows that (59) commutes for $\mathcal{E} = T^*\mathcal{X}$ for all such $(\underline{f}, \eta), (\underline{g}, \zeta)$. Hence $T^*\mathcal{X}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}$ -module.

Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a 1-morphism of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks. Then $f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}), T^*\mathcal{X}$ are $\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{X}$ -modules. Define $\Omega_f : f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow T^*\mathcal{X}$ to be the unique morphism characterized as follows. Let $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, $\underline{W}$, $\underline{\pi}_U$, $\underline{\pi}_V$ be as

in Definition 9.8, with (62) Cartesian. Then the following diagram of morphisms of $\mathcal{O}_W$ -modules commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y})(\underline{U}, u)) & \xrightarrow{i(T^*\mathcal{Y}, f, u, v, \zeta)} & \pi_{\underline{V}}^*((T^*\mathcal{Y})(\underline{V}, v)) = \pi_{\underline{V}}^*(T^*\underline{V}) \\ \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(\Omega_f(\underline{U}, u)) \downarrow & & \Omega_{\pi_{\underline{V}}} \downarrow \\ \pi_{\underline{U}}^*((T^*\mathcal{X})(\underline{U}, u)) & \xrightarrow{(T^*\mathcal{X})(\pi_{\underline{U}}, \text{id}_{u \circ \pi_{\underline{U}}})} & (T^*\mathcal{X})(\underline{W}, u \circ \pi_{\underline{U}}) = T^*\underline{W}. \end{array}$$

This determines $\pi_{\underline{U}}^*(\Omega_f(\underline{U}, u))$ uniquely. Over all $(\underline{V}, v)$, using descent for morphisms for $\mathcal{O}_U$ -modules on C^∞ -schemes $\underline{U}$ in the étale topology, this determines the morphisms $\Omega_f(\underline{U}, u)$, and over all $(\underline{U}, u)$ these determine Ω_f .

From Proposition 9.3 and Theorem 6.16(c),(d) we deduce:

Proposition 9.14. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stack. If $\mathcal{X}$ is locally fair then $T^*\mathcal{X}$ is quasicoherent. If $\mathcal{X}$ is locally good then $T^*\mathcal{X}$ is coherent. If $\mathcal{X}$ is an orbifold of dimension n , which may have boundary or corners, then $T^*\mathcal{X}$ is a vector bundle of rank n .*

Here is the analogue of Theorem 6.17. Note the extra $\eta^*(T^*\mathcal{Z})$ in (65).

Theorem 9.15. (a) *Let $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be 1-morphisms of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks. Then*

$$\Omega_{g \circ f} = \Omega_f \circ f^*(\Omega_g) \circ I_{f,g}(T^*\mathcal{Z}) \quad (63)$$

as morphisms $(g \circ f)^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}) \rightarrow T^*\mathcal{X}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -mod.

(b) *Let $f, g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be 1-morphisms of Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks and $\eta : f \Rightarrow g$ a 2-morphism. Then $\Omega_f = \Omega_g \circ \eta^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}) : f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow T^*\mathcal{X}$.*

(c) *Suppose $\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ are locally fair Deligne–Mumford C^∞ -stacks with a 2-Cartesian square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{W} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{Y} \\ \downarrow e & \begin{array}{c} f \\ \eta \nearrow \\ g \end{array} & \downarrow h \\ \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{Z} \end{array} \quad (64)$$

in $\mathbf{DMC}^\infty \mathbf{Sta}^{\text{lf}}$, so that $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Y}$. Then the following is exact in $\text{qcoh}(\mathcal{W})$:

$$(g \circ e)^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}) \xrightarrow{e^*(\Omega_g) \circ I_{e,g}(T^*\mathcal{Z}) \oplus -f^*(\Omega_h) \circ I_{f,h}(T^*\mathcal{Z}) \circ \eta^*(T^*\mathcal{Z})} e^*(T^*\mathcal{X}) \oplus f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}) \xrightarrow{\Omega_e \oplus \Omega_f} T^*\mathcal{W} \rightarrow 0. \quad (65)$$

Proof. For (a), let $u : \bar{\underline{U}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \bar{\underline{V}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $w : \bar{\underline{W}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be étale. Then there is a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{V}'$ with $\bar{\underline{V}}' = \bar{\underline{V}} \times_{g \circ v, \mathcal{Z}, w} \bar{\underline{W}}$, and fibre product projections $\pi_{\underline{V}} : \underline{V}' \rightarrow \underline{V}$, $\pi_{\underline{W}} : \underline{V}' \rightarrow \underline{W}$. Define $v' = v \circ \pi_{\underline{V}} : \underline{V}' \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. Then v' is étale, as v is and w is so $\pi_{\underline{V}}$ is. Similarly, there is a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{U}'$ with $\bar{\underline{U}}' = \bar{\underline{U}} \times_{f \circ u, \mathcal{X}, v'} \bar{\underline{V}}'$,

and fibre product projections $\pi_{\underline{U}} : \underline{U}' \rightarrow \underline{U}$, $\pi_{\underline{V}'} : \underline{V}' \rightarrow \underline{V}'$. Define an étale 1-morphism $u' = u \circ \pi_{\underline{U}} : \underline{U}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$. Then we have a 2-commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{Y} & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{Z} \\
 \downarrow u & \nearrow \pi_{\underline{U}} & \downarrow v & \nearrow \pi_{\underline{V}'} & \downarrow w \\
 \underline{U} & \xrightarrow{\eta} & \underline{V} & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & \underline{W} \\
 \downarrow u' & \nearrow \pi_{\underline{U}'} & \downarrow v' & \nearrow \pi_{\underline{W}} & \downarrow \\
 \underline{U}' & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\underline{U}'}} & \underline{V}' & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\underline{W}}} & \underline{W}
 \end{array}$$

with 2-Cartesian squares. On $\underline{U}'$ and $\underline{V}'$ we have commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \pi_{\underline{U}}^*(f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}))(\underline{U}, u) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{i(T^*\mathcal{Y}, f, u, v', \eta)} & \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*((T^*\mathcal{Y})(\underline{V}', v')) = \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(T^*\underline{V}') \\
 \cong \downarrow (f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}))(\pi_{\underline{U}}, \text{id}_{u'}) & & \Omega_{\pi_{\underline{V}'}} \downarrow \\
 (f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}))(\underline{U}', u') & \xrightarrow[\Omega_f(\underline{U}', u')]{\Omega_f(\underline{U}', u')} & (T^*\mathcal{X})(\underline{U}', u') = T^*\underline{U}'
 \end{array} \quad (66)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\underline{V}, v) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{i(T^*\mathcal{Z}, g, v, w, \zeta)} & \pi_{\underline{W}}^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}(\underline{W}, w)) = \pi_{\underline{W}}^*(T^*\underline{W}) \\
 \cong \downarrow (g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\pi_{\underline{V}'}, \text{id}_{v'}) & & \Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}}} \downarrow \\
 (g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\underline{V}', v') & \xrightarrow[\Omega_g(\underline{V}', v')]{\Omega_g(\underline{V}', v')} & (T^*\mathcal{Y})(\underline{V}', v') = T^*\underline{V}'.
 \end{array} \quad (67)$$

Applying $\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*$ to (67) we make another commutative diagram on $\underline{U}'$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\pi_{\underline{V}}^*(g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z})(\underline{V}, v))) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(i(T^*\mathcal{Z}, g, v, w, \zeta))} & \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\pi_{\underline{W}}^*(T^*\underline{W})) \\
 \cong \downarrow \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*((g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\pi_{\underline{V}'}, \text{id}_{v'})) & & \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}}}) \downarrow \\
 \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*((g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\underline{V}', v')) & \xrightarrow[\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\Omega_g(\underline{V}', v'))]{\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\Omega_g(\underline{V}', v'))} & \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(T^*\underline{V}') \\
 \cong \downarrow (f^*(g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))) (\pi_{\underline{U}}, \text{id}_{u'}) & & (f^*(T^*\mathcal{U}))(\pi_{\underline{U}}, \text{id}_{u'}) \downarrow \cong \\
 (f^*(g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))) (\underline{U}', u') & \xrightarrow[(f^*(\Omega_g))(\underline{U}', u')]{(f^*(\Omega_g))(\underline{U}', u')} & (f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}))(\underline{U}', u').
 \end{array} \quad (68)$$

By Theorem 6.17(a) the following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (\pi_{\underline{W}} \circ \pi_{\underline{V}'})^*(T^*\underline{W}) & \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}} \circ \pi_{\underline{V}'}}} & T^*\underline{U}' \\
 I_{\pi_{\underline{V}'}, \pi_{\underline{W}}}(T^*\underline{W}) \downarrow \cong & & \uparrow \Omega_{\pi_{\underline{V}'}} \\
 \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\pi_{\underline{W}}^*(T^*\underline{W})) & \xrightarrow[\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}}})]{\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}}})} & \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(T^*\underline{V}').
 \end{array} \quad (69)$$

Using all this we obtain a commutative diagram on $\underline{U}'$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 ((g \circ f)^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\underline{U}', u') & \xrightarrow[\Omega_{g \circ f}(\underline{U}', u')]{\Omega_{g \circ f}(\underline{U}', u')} & (T^*\mathcal{X})(\underline{U}', u') \\
 \downarrow \cong & \swarrow \cong & \uparrow \Omega_f(\underline{U}', u') \\
 & (\pi_{\underline{W}} \circ \pi_{\underline{V}'})^*(T^*\underline{W}) \longrightarrow T^*\underline{U}' & \\
 \cong \downarrow (I_{f, g}(T^*\mathcal{Z}))(\underline{U}', u') \downarrow \cong & \uparrow & \\
 & \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\pi_{\underline{W}}^*(T^*\underline{W})) \longrightarrow \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(T^*\underline{V}') & \\
 \downarrow \cong & \swarrow \cong & \downarrow \cong \\
 (f^*(g^*(T^*\mathcal{Z}))) (\underline{U}', u') & \xrightarrow[(f^*(\Omega_g))(\underline{U}', u')]{(f^*(\Omega_g))(\underline{U}', u')} & (f^*(T^*\mathcal{Y}))(\underline{U}', u').
 \end{array} \quad (70)$$

Here the right hand quadrilateral of (70) comes from (66), the bottom quadrilateral from (68), the central square is (69), and the remaining two quadrilaterals are similar. Thus, the outer square of (70) commutes. But this is just (63) evaluated at $(\underline{U}', u')$. If $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $w : \underline{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ are étale atlases then $u' : \underline{U}' \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is also an étale atlas, and (63) evaluated on an atlas implies it in general. This proves part (a).

Part (b) is immediate from the definitions. For (c), let $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $w : \underline{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be étale. Then $\underline{U}, \underline{V}, \underline{W}$ are locally fair, as $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ are and u, v, w are étale. There are C^∞ -schemes $\underline{U}', \underline{V}'$, with $\underline{U}' = \underline{U} \times_{g \circ u, \mathcal{Z}, w} \underline{W}$, $\underline{V}' = \underline{V} \times_{h \circ v, \mathcal{Z}, w} \underline{W}$, and fibre product projections $\pi_{\underline{U}'} : \underline{U}' \rightarrow \underline{U}$, $\pi_{\underline{W}} : \underline{U}' \rightarrow \underline{W}$, $\pi_{\underline{V}'} : \underline{V}' \rightarrow \underline{V}$, $\pi_{\underline{W}} : \underline{V}' \rightarrow \underline{W}$. Then $\pi_{\underline{U}}, \pi_{\underline{V}}$ are étale as w is, so $\underline{U}', \underline{V}'$ are locally fair as $\underline{U}, \underline{V}$ are. Define a C^∞ -scheme $\underline{T} = \underline{U}' \times_{\pi_{\underline{W}}, \underline{W}, \pi_{\underline{W}}} \underline{V}'$. Then $\underline{T}$ is locally fair by Theorem 4.26. The 1-morphisms $u' \circ \pi_{\underline{U}'} : \underline{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $v' \circ \pi_{\underline{V}'} : \underline{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ have a natural 2-isomorphism $g \circ (u' \circ \pi_{\underline{U}'}) \Rightarrow h \circ (v' \circ \pi_{\underline{V}'})$ constructed from the 2-isomorphisms in the 2-Cartesian squares constructing $\underline{U}', \underline{V}'$. Thus as $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{Y}$ there is a 1-morphism $t : \underline{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$, unique up to 2-isomorphism, such that $u' \circ \pi_{\underline{U}'} \cong e \circ t$ and $v' \circ \pi_{\underline{V}'} \cong f \circ t$. Also t is étale. This gives a 2-commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & \underline{T} & \xrightarrow{t} & \mathcal{W} & \\
 \pi_{\underline{U}'} \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_{\underline{V}'} & & \searrow f \\
 \underline{U}' & \xrightarrow{u'} & \mathcal{X} & \xleftarrow{e} & \mathcal{W} \\
 & \searrow \pi_{\underline{W}} & & \searrow g & \\
 & \underline{V}' & \xrightarrow{v'} & \mathcal{Y} & \\
 & \swarrow \pi_{\underline{W}} & & \swarrow h & \\
 & \underline{W} & \xrightarrow{w} & \mathcal{Z} &
 \end{array}$$

in which the leftmost and rightmost squares are 2-Cartesian.

Applying Theorem 6.17(b) to the Cartesian square defining $\underline{T}$ gives an exact sequence in $\text{qcoh}(\underline{T})$:

$$(\pi_{\underline{W}} \circ \pi_{\underline{U}'})^*(T^*\underline{W}) \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} \pi_{\underline{U}'}^*(\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}}} \circ I_{\pi_{\underline{U}'}, \pi_{\underline{W}}}(T^*\underline{W}) \oplus \\ -\pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{W}}} \circ I_{\pi_{\underline{V}'}, \pi_{\underline{W}}}(T^*\underline{W}) \end{smallmatrix}} \pi_{\underline{U}'}^*(T^*\underline{U}') \oplus \pi_{\underline{V}'}^*(T^*\underline{V}') \xrightarrow{\Omega_{\pi_{\underline{U}'}} \oplus \Omega_{\pi_{\underline{V}'}}} T^*\underline{T} \rightarrow 0. \quad (71)$$

By a similar argument to (a), we can use (71) to deduce that (65) evaluated at $(\underline{T}, t)$ holds. If $u : \underline{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $v : \underline{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $w : \underline{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ are atlases then $t : \underline{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is an atlas, so this implies (65), and proves (c). $\square$

References

- [1] A. Adem, J. Leida and Y. Ruan, *Orbifolds and Stringy Topology*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. 171, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [2] M. Artin, *Grothendieck topologies*, Harvard University Notes, 1962.
- [3] K. Behrend, D. Edidin, B. Fantechi, W. Fulton, L. Göttsche and A. Kresch, *Introduction to stacks*, book in preparation, 2009.

- [4] K. Behrend and P. Xu, *Differentiable stacks and gerbes*, math.DG/0605694, 2006.
- [5] F. Borceux, *Handbook of categorical algebra 1. Basic category theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications 50, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [6] M. Bunge and E.J. Dubuc, *Local concepts in synthetic differential geometry and germ representability*, pages 93–159 in D.W. Kueker, E.G.K. López-Escobar and C.H. Smith, editors, *Mathematical logic and theoretical computer science*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 106, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1987.
- [7] W. Chen and Y. Ruan, *Orbifold Gromov–Witten theory*, pages 25–86 in A. Adem, J. Morava and Y. Ruan, editors, *Orbifolds in mathematics and physics*, Cont. Math. 310, A.M.S., Providence, RI, 2002. math.AG/0103156.
- [8] P. Deligne and D. Mumford, *The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus*, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. 36 (1969), 75–109.
- [9] E.J. Dubuc, *Sur les modèles de la géométrie différentielle synthétique*, Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég. 20 (1979), 231–279.
- [10] E.J. Dubuc, *Schémas C^∞* , Prepub. de la Université de Montreal 80 (1980), Exposé 3.
- [11] E.J. Dubuc, *C^∞ -schemes*, Amer. J. Math. 103 (1981), 683–690.
- [12] E.J. Dubuc, *Open covers and infinitary operations in C^∞ -rings*, Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég. 22 (1981), 287–300.
- [13] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory – anomaly and obstruction*, Parts I & II. AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 46.1 & 46.2, A.M.S./International Press, 2009.
- [14] R. Godement, *Topologie algébrique et théorie des faisceaux*, Hermann, Paris, 1958.
- [15] T.L. Gómez, *Algebraic stacks*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. 111 (2001), 1–31. math.AG/9911199.
- [16] A. Grothendieck, *Elements de Géométrie Algébrique I*, Publ. Math. IHES 4, 1960.
- [17] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Math. 52, Springer, New York, 1977.
- [18] J. Heinloth, *Some notes on differentiable stacks*, pages 1–32 in Y. Tschinkel, editor, Mathematisches Institut Universität Göttingen, Seminars 2004–2005, Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2005.

- [19] L. Illusie, *Complexe cotangent et déformations. I*, Springer Lecture Notes in Math. 239, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.
- [20] D. Joyce, *On manifolds with corners*, to appear in *Advances of Geometric Analysis*, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics series, International Press, Boston, 2011. arXiv:0910.3518.
- [21] D. Joyce, *An introduction to C^∞ -schemes and C^∞ -algebraic geometry*, arXiv:1104.4951, 2011.
- [22] D. Joyce, *D-manifolds and d-orbifolds: a theory of derived differential geometry*, book in preparation, 2011. Preliminary version available at <http://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/~joyce/>.
- [23] A. Kock, *Synthetic differential geometry*, second edition, L.M.S. Lecture Notes 333, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [24] G. Laumon and L. Moret-Bailly, *Champs algébriques*, Ergeb. der Math. und ihrer Grenzgebiete 39, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.
- [25] E. Lerman, *Orbifolds as stacks?*, arXiv:0806.4160, 2008.
- [26] J. Lurie, *Derived Algebraic Geometry I: Stable ∞ -categories*, math.CT/0608228, 2006.
- [27] S. MacLane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, second edition, Graduate Texts in Math. 5, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [28] D.S. Metzler, *Topological and smooth stacks*, math.DG/0306176, 2003.
- [29] I. Moerdijk, *Orbifolds as groupoids: an introduction*, pages 205–222 in A. Adem, J. Morava and Y. Ruan, editors, *Orbifolds in Mathematics and Physics*, Cont. Math. 310, A.M.S., Providence, RI, 2002. math.DG/0203100.
- [30] I. Moerdijk and D.A. Pronk, *Orbifolds, sheaves and groupoids*, K-theory 12 (1997), 3–21.
- [31] I. Moerdijk, N. van Quê and G.E. Reyes, *Rings of smooth functions and their localizations. II*, pages 277–300 in D.W. Kueker, E.G.K. López-Escobar and C.H. Smith, editors, *Mathematical logic and theoretical computer science*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Math. 106, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1987.
- [32] I. Moerdijk and G.E. Reyes, *Rings of smooth functions and their localizations. I*, J. Algebra 99 (1986), 324–336.
- [33] I. Moerdijk and G.E. Reyes, *Models for smooth infinitesimal analysis*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [34] B. Noohi, *Foundations of topological stacks. I*, math.AG/0503247, 2005.

- [35] D. Pronk, *Etendues and stacks as bicategories of fractions*, Compositio Math. 102 (1996), 243–303.
- [36] G.E. Reyes, *Embedding manifolds with boundary in smooth toposes*, Cah. Topol. Géom. Différ. Catég. 48 (2007), 83–103.
- [37] G.E. Reyes and N. van Quê, *Smooth functors and synthetic calculus*, pages 377–395 in A.S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen, editors, *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, North-Holland, 1982.
- [38] I. Satake, *On a generalization of the notion of manifold*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 42 (1956), 359–363.
- [39] D.I. Spivak, *Derived smooth manifolds*, Duke Mathematical Journal 153 (2010), 55–128. arXiv:0810.5174.
- [40] A. Vistoli, *Grothendieck topologies, fibered categories and descent theory*, pages 1–104 in B. Fantechi et al., editors, *Fundamental algebraic geometry*, Math. Surveys and Monographs 123, A.M.S., Providence, RI, 2005. math.AG/0412512.
- [41] C. Voisin, *Hodge Theory and Complex Algebraic Geometry, I*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

THE MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, 24-29 ST. GILES, OXFORD, OX1 3LB, U.K.
 E-MAIL: `joyce@maths.ox.ac.uk`